

## SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1945

*(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Father, we lift up our hearts as again o'er the earth's dark shadows the angels' song is heard. We rejoice with adoring wonder that the skies are aflame with shining glory and vocal with ecstatic anthems of the winged heralds of peace, for over an earth grown old with its burden of care again the voice of the Christ Child rings out with its cheer that we all are the children of God.

With the coming of Christmas everywhere as the only alternative to chaos, grant us such courage that our efforts may never falter; such love that every barrier to brotherhood and equality may be beaten down; such wisdom that every problem of boundary and trade, of language and culture, may be solved; such faith that when the way is long and hard we may yet persevere to the end in the knowledge that Thy sovereign will reigneth, as revealed in the redeeming Word made flesh. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—  
APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On December 14, 1945:

S. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to provide for national elections in the Philippine Islands.

On December 15, 1945:

S. 1212. An act to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; and

S. 1278. An act to provide for the taxation of rolling stock of railroad and other companies operated in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor. Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the last session be approved without reading.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the floor, and I do not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, of his own motion, will state that, without objection, the Journal of the

previous session will be approved without reading.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I have the floor, and I am not inclined to yield. The Senator from New York has not asked me to yield?

Mr. WAGNER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, I am entitled to the floor at the opening of the session.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not recall the Senator's name being mentioned in the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will suspend for a moment while the Chair sees what was done.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 13th instant, the Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for the free entry of the Jews, and the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas and will then recognize the Senator from New York.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair. Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to inquire what effect the unanimous-consent agreement has upon the fact that the Federal pay bill is the unfinished business before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has no effect on it at all, except that by the unanimous-consent agreement it was agreed that the resolution as to the Jews entering Palestine would come up today.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator from Texas will yield for a further parliamentary inquiry, does that mean that, as chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I am entitled to call for the regular order whenever I desire?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can call for the regular order at any time during the consideration of the concurrent resolution, which is before the Senate under a unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate, made when the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair and did not know about it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Unfortunately, it was made when I was not present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was made, and must be carried out, of course.

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand that; but if the President pro tempore will further bear with me, am I to understand, then, that I would be entitled to call for the regular order when I desire?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator would.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not present at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, but I agree that the resolution should come up today. I did not know, however, that the agreement was to be so exclusive and so iron-bound as it seems to have been.

Robert L. Cremer, from the 15th day of May 1942.

Austin Wiggins, Jr., from the 15th day of May 1942.

James H. Phillips, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Elswin P. Dunn, from the 8th day of June 1942.

John M. Walker, Jr., from the 18th day of June 1942.

David R. Moak, from the 25th day of June 1942.

Edmond P. Hartsock, from the 18th day of July 1942.

Ralph E. Robinson, from the 18th day of July 1942.

Charles E. Call, from the 1st day of October 1942.

Emmett O. Anglin, Jr., from the 1st day of November 1942.

Phillip C. DeLong, from the 16th day of December 1942.

Edwin H. McCaleb III, from the 1st day of February 1943.

Bruce J. Matheson, from the 1st day of February 1943.

Thomas H. Miller, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1943.

John H. Glenn, Jr., from the 16th day of March 1943.

Earl W. Johnson, from the 16th day of March 1943.

George W. Brewer, from the 1st day of April 1943.

Loren K. Bronleewe, from the 1st day of April 1943.

Thomas J. Burnam, from the 1st day of April 1943.

David Cleeland, from the 16th day of April 1943.

Lynn W. Griffiths, from the 16th day of April 1943.

John E. Hansen, from the 16th day of April 1943.

George F. Bauman, from the 16th day of May 1943.

Stewart R. Lauer, from the 16th day of May 1943.

Joseph A. Mitchell, from the 16th day of May 1943.

George E. Jenkins, from the 1st day of June 1943.

Stanley J. Posluszny, from the 1st day of June 1943.

Richard H. Rainforth, from the 1st day of June 1943.

Eddie C. Torbett, from the 1st day of June 1943.

Thomas T. Tulipane, from the 16th day of June 1943.

Boyd "M" Phelps, from the 1st day of July 1943.

Harold D. Shields, from the 1st day of July 1943.

James C. Frew, from the 16th day of July 1943.

Richard M. Moore, from the 16th day of July 1943.

William K. Treynor, from the 16th day of July 1943.

Albert F. Dellamano, from the 1st day of August 1943.

Robert E. Wellwood, from the 1st day of August 1943.

Claude O. Barnhill, Jr., from the 16th day of August 1943.

Robert S. Hemstad, from the 16th day of August 1943.

Elmer E. Luther, from the 1st day of September 1943.

Dwight E. Mayo, from the 1st day of September 1943.

George H. Elias, from the 1st day of October 1943.

Frank K. Relly, Jr., from the 1st day of November 1943.

Walter E. Daniel, from the 16th day of December 1943.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4649, known as the UNRRA authorization bill. I wish to assure the Senate it will take a very short time, and it is probably the most important matter now pending for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is in order.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement which was made provided that Senate Resolution 44 should come up at the opening of the session today, and that I was to be permitted to address the Senate upon it. That is all a part of the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement was stated by the Chair a while ago. The agreement was made when the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair, but the Chair has read the unanimous-consent agreement, and as it was made and given to him it does not provide that the Senator from New York should have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would be a violation of the rules if it did, because the Chair recognized me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas was in front of the Chair and had a paper in his hand and asked for recognition, and under the rules of the Senate, unless by unanimous consent, the first Senator to arise and address the Senate is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as a matter of information, may I read the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. WAGNER. Here is the unanimous-consent agreement made on my request:

After conferring with the majority and minority leaders, and with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and having obtained their consent, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the beginning of the session, the Senate proceed to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, which deals with the Palestine problem, and that I may be permitted to address myself to the resolution when it is taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator from New York, no one is trying to prevent his addressing the Senate when the resolution is taken up, but the agreement does not say he shall make the first speech of the day. It does not say he shall have a corner on recognition; it does not give him a monopoly of the floor, but simply says that he shall be allowed to address the Senate.

Mr. WAGNER. When the resolution is taken up.

Mr. CONNALLY. When it is taken up, of course.

Mr. WAGNER. That is the unanimous-consent agreement, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with that at all.

Mr. WAGNER. Certainly it is, as plain as day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I insist on my motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. If this matter is to involve controversy, I think there should be a quorum present. I do not know who is interested in the resolution which the Senator from New York is pressing, or whether Senators would prefer to go on with the UNRRA bill, which the Senator from Texas is seeking to have considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will take only a little while, I will say to the Senator from Maine, because we thrashed the question out a day or so ago when the appropriation was before the Senate. So I anticipate only very brief debate.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I am merely insisting upon the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into Thursday, which I have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think the unanimous-consent agreement had anything in it about the order in which Senators should be recognized; but the Chair has recognized the Senator from New York now, the motion pending is debatable, and therefore the Senator can make his address, if he desires to do so.

Mr. WAGNER. I am merely asking the Senate to follow the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is mistaken about the language that is used. It does not require that the Senator should be recognized first.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not think I had lost the floor. The Senator from Maine asked me to yield for the purpose of enabling him to have a quorum called. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the Senator from Texas had taken his seat, and supposed, therefore, he had yielded the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. The question now is on my motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. WAGNER. I inquire of the Chair whether the Chair will recognize the unanimous-consent agreement which was made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the unanimous-consent agreement which was made, and has laid the matter before the Senate. However, the motion of the Senator from Texas has priority over all other motions. The Senator can address himself to anything he desires.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I make the point of order that there is no

quorum present. I ask for a quorum call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York has not yielded for that purpose. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capelhart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. I announce that he is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably absent on important business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

**RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOME-  
LAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE**

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 44) relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews, which is as follows:

Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved "That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution; and

Whereas these urgent necessities are evidenced by the President's request for the immediate right of entry into Palestine of 100,000 additional Jewish refugees; and

Whereas the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine is resulting in its improvement in agricultural, financial, hygienic, and general economic conditions; and

Whereas the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a Joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry to examine conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and the Jewish situation in Europe and have requested a report within 120 days: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I will not yield; no. I wish to proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the essence of the resolution on Palestine, reported favorably by a 17-to-1 vote of the Foreign Relations Committee, is to be found in the following language:

That the interest shown by the President in the solution of this problem is hereby commended, and that the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. President, we are now talking about maintaining peace through the control of the atomic bomb. I devoutly hope that these efforts will prove successful. Another world war would destroy us all. But let us remind ourselves that the principles of peace do not change as rapidly as the instruments of war. New instruments of war are constantly discovered, but the principles of peace are as eternal and unchanging as the Sermon on the Mount.

Permanent peace can rest only upon the foundation of the eternal bases of morality. Permanent peace requires justice and truth and fair dealing—toward the weak as well as the strong, toward the oppressed as well as the free, toward those who are homeless as well as those who are secure.

These are the reasons why I believe that the Palestine question is so vital. A few hundred thousand more or even a few million more Jews in Palestine may not weigh so heavily in the scales of world affairs. One more small commonwealth, added to the long list of the nations of the world, may not seem to count for much.

Palestine will never be able to start a war or keep the peace. But Palestine as a symbol of the faith of the great nations, Palestine as a test of the integrity and conscience of mankind, Palestine as a signpost of where the world is going—that is terribly important. That carries a tremendous weight in the scales of the future of the world.

The very fact that Palestine and the Jewish question may look small, in the perspective of world affairs, is the very reason why it is so large and so important. For if the great powers of the world prove themselves incompetent to deal honestly and fairly with a matter of this size, what hope or faith can we have that they will rise to the enormously larger problems of the future? If even the small pressures being brought to bear against a just solution of the Palestine question—the small pressures of oil concessions and Arab threats—if even these small pressures are enough to divert Great Britain or America from the course of honor, how pitifully inadequate is the state of our international morality.

Did anyone ever hear of a police force that was too weak or timid to stop a small dance-hall brawl, but that was strong enough to quell a riot? Did anyone ever hear of a fire department that was too slow to get to one small fire, but that was adequate to deal with the possibility of a conflagration? What sense, then, does it make to say that the world is unable at this time to do justice toward Palestine?

Was a League of Nations, which was too weak to prevent the plunder of Ethiopia or the initial pillage of Manchuria, strong enough to prevent World War II?

If the great English-speaking peoples today shrink away from the first small test and challenge placed before them, will a United Nations Organization be strong enough to fulfill its many fearful and sacred trust of the future?

Can we maintain and support the infamous repudiation of Palestine, embodied in the Chamberlain white paper

of 1939, without reaping once again the consequences of Chamberlainism?

Can we resort to appeasement, without suffering again the holocaust which resulted from appeasement?

Can we make the remainder of the twentieth century a golden era of international morality, if we proclaim from the housetops that when we talk about international morality we are holding our tongues in our cheeks?

What are the compelling circumstances, alleged to be so important, which are standing in the way of Britain's fulfillment of her promises and duties? I should like to have these alleged compelling circumstances brought out into the light, and discussed out in the open. I am not satisfied when they remain hidden in the cloakrooms of diplomacy. Until they are brought to light, I will not believe that they legitimately exist. The only interpretation now possible is that these so-called compelling circumstances are small and ungenerous and unworthy, and that they cannot stand the light of day.

This resolution commends the President for his interest in the solution of this problem. Personally, I do not believe that more study is necessary. We need action. But if we are to be sure that the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry is to serve a useful purpose, the immediate adoption of this resolution by the Congress is imperative. We want the members of the Committee to have discretion in their methods. We want the members of the Committee to have discretion in devising the quickest possible means of fulfilling the promises already made for Palestine. But we do not want the Committee to have the discretion to make its own decisions on matters of fundamental policy. We do not want the Committee to recast promises or reformulate objectives. We do not want the Committee to substitute the judgment of a few men, however worthy, for the intent and determination of the American Congress and the American people. In this whole matter, the members of the Committee should be the servants and not the masters of the people at large. We should by this resolution let the Committee know what we want it to do, and we expect it to do just that, without delay.

The facts that are available to us now are simple and crystal clear. What are these facts?

For countless generations, the dispersed and oppressed Jewish people have looked toward Palestine as a land of hope and promise. This promise has been repeated many times by statesmen and politicians.

But we must remember that in the view of many, this promise was a holy promise, originating from a higher source whose Fatherhood we all acknowledge.

This promise was historically formalized in the Balfour Declaration of a generation ago.

Acting on this promise, the Jews already in Palestine have made superhuman sacrifices. They have reclaimed a wilderness and established a modern civilization—a civilization founded upon

the highest ideals of democracy, tolerance, and equality of opportunity.

When World War II commenced and Britain was in mortal danger the Jewish people in Palestine repaid evil with good. Despite Britain's violation of her pledge to them, they fought and died to maintain Britain's life line. The value of their aid was incalculable.

Now, to the frustration and disappointment of these Jews in Palestine, there is added the desperate plight of their hounded and persecuted brethren in Europe. These Jews in Europe are now but a pitiful remnant—a mere brand saved from the flame of Nazi terror.

Mr. President, while the great and powerful Empire of Britain is stretching out its hands to us and asking for loans, what are the Jewish people asking? They are asking merely for an opportunity to save themselves. Unlike Britain, they are not asking that we create a new obligation running from them to us. They are asking merely that we see to the fulfilment of an obligation running from us to them.

This obligation toward the Jews and toward Palestine is not on the part of Britain alone. It is an American obligation as well. It is an American obligation because the American Congress long ago went on record in favor of its fulfillment. It is an American obligation backed by a greater power and a higher law than the Congress—the overwhelming sentiment and conscience of the American people whom we here represent. It is an American obligation for a still greater reason—because America cannot escape its role in world peace and world justice, because the iniquity and injustice of the past handling of the Palestine question is the road to international anarchy and war.

We have heard that the entry of Jews into Palestine might create a Jewish majority there, and that this would be hurtful to Arab interests. No one has offered proof to support this assertion of injury to the Arabs. It is the responsibility of the great nations, as this resolution clearly states, to make certain that the increasing Jewish colonization of Palestine is consistent with equality and justice for all. This is an affirmative responsibility, but we cannot avoid it without admitting abject failure to deal with any problem of international adjustment.

What if it be true that the Jews may come to constitute a majority in Palestine? Was this not known when the original promise was made? For countless generations the Jews have been in the minority everywhere—and generally a persecuted minority. What is wrong with the proposition that in one place they may come to be the majority group?

And what alternative solutions have been offered? Certainly it is no solution to leave the remnants of the Jews of central Europe in their present unspeakable plight. Certainly it is no solution to confirm and condone the repudiation of obligations founded on the honor of Britain and America.

The resolution now before the Senate is directed toward the only honorable fulfillment of this sacred obligation. Half measures and sleight-of-hand are un-

acceptable. There can be no honorable Palestine policy, except in keeping with the original purpose and intent of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine mandate.

There must be an abrogation, now and at once, of artificial restrictions on immigration and colonization on the land. The Jews who want to go to Palestine must be facilitated to the fullest possible economic extent in reaching their refuge and accomplishing their redemption. We must, then, assist them and assist those who await them there with open arms and yearning hearts, in the reconstruction of Palestine, as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men shall enjoy equal rights.

If we take half measures they will be half measures on the road toward the rapid deterioration of world organization for the purposes of peace. Only complete measures, taken at once, can mend the dangerous breaches already created by wrongdoing and neglect.

We and the world are rapidly being confronted with decisions as important as the decisions made at Munich. I pray God that we do not repeat the fatal errors which sacrificed 40,000,000 lives.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the resolution, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, at the moment the Senate has under consideration a motion that it proceed with the consideration of the UNRRA bill. The Palestine resolution is not formally before us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. For what purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. For a question.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the pending motion is that the Senate proceed to consider the UNRRA bill. I deplore the consumption of time on the resolution relating to Palestine. We shall reach that resolution in due time. I have no disposition to delay its consideration, but I hope Senators will permit the Senate to vote on the motion relative to the UNRRA bill and take final action on that bill. Then the Senate can take up the Palestine resolution. I think it is just about as important to give the Jewish people in Europe food so that they will not starve before they can go to Palestine; for if we let them starve before they can reach Palestine, it will not do much good to open the door to Palestine to them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, without passing on the relative importance of these two measures, I wish to say that it seems to me when we take up a measure we should consider it until it is finally disposed of, if possible. Never before since I have been a Member of the Senate have I seen quite the confusion which has existed in the last 2 weeks as a result of interrupting the consideration of

one measure with consideration of another. Both the measures which have just now been referred to are short ones; and if we finish consideration of the Palestine resolution first, we can then proceed to consider the UNRRA bill. Of course, I think the Senate should pass the measure sponsored by the Senator from Texas.

In the meantime I desire to urge on the Senate the adoption of the so-called Palestine resolution. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself have introduced several resolutions on that subject during the past 2 years. In my opinion, the present session of Congress has before it nothing of any greater importance in respect to foreign policy than the Palestine resolution, because I think there is no more important step toward a permanent peace than the acceptance by Congress of the principle of the Palestine resolution. Our resolution states that—

The United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power—

That is Great Britain—

to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

Mr. President, we intend this resolution to be a reaffirmation of the Balfour Declaration of 1917. That declaration, which was approved by the British Government and the British Cabinet, stated unequivocally in favor of—

the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people \* \* \* it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

That is the end of the quotation from the Balfour declaration.

In the mandate from the League of Nations, the British, as the mandatory, undertook to put that declaration into effect, and it is written into the mandate from the League of Nations.

In April 1922 Congress adopted a resolution stating its satisfaction that—

Owing to the outcome of the World War and their part therein, the Jewish people, under definite and adequate national guarantee, are to be enabled to recreate and reorganize a national home in the land of their fathers.

Mr. President, when I first studied the whole problem it seemed clear to me, beyond a possibility of doubt, that both Britain and the United States are clearly committed, by promises of support assumed as solemnly as possible, to carry out the general policy stated in this resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the resolution of 1922 was unanimously adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and it was signed by President Harding.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Some objection has been made to the fact that our declaration in favor of a free commonwealth—the word “commonwealth” is used in the resolution—set up by a Jewish majority goes beyond the idea of a Jewish national home, as contained in the Balfour Declaration. Those who had to do with the matter at the time of the World War, however, spoke repeatedly of a Jewish commonwealth, meaning a commonwealth set up when a majority of the people in that district were Jews. Certainly it was not meant to be an old men's home for Jews in an Arab Palestine. The Jews already had the rights of a minority race in nearly all countries throughout the world. There would have been no particular point in giving them the same status in Palestine. The expression “Jewish commonwealth” was used in the Versailles Conference by Lloyd George, and has been used by Winston Churchill. Lloyd George said:

It was contemplated that when the time arrived for according representative institutions to Palestine, if the Jews had meanwhile responded to the opportunity afforded them by the idea of a national home and had become a definite majority of the inhabitants, then Palestine would thus become a Jewish commonwealth.

President Wilson said, on March 3, 1919:

I am persuaded that the Allied Nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish commonwealth.

Because the British Government and others have tried to limit the term “Jewish national home,” so that it means practically nothing, we have felt it essential that there be at this time a clear repudiation of that position by the use of the term “commonwealth.” The very terms of the Balfour Declaration itself, assuring complete, equal rights to non-Jewish races, show clearly that a Jewish majority in Palestine was intended.

So the purpose of this resolution is to declare in favor of a policy which shall permit the unrestricted migration of Jews into Palestine until they become a majority of the people there, at which time a free and independent state shall be organized. So far as I know, no conditions relative to Palestine have changed since the World War, except the attitude of the various Arab states. Apparently that is the reason for the objection which has arisen. Previous to the World War, all that territory was part of the Turkish Empire. The Allies liberated all that territory and set up a number of states—Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and a number of other states—in which the Arabs clearly had a majority. At the same time they set up a separate state in Palestine, in which the Arabs also had a majority, but subject to the terms of the Balfour Declaration which provided for the immigration of Jews until the majority was Jewish. There was no other reason to set up

Palestine as a separate state, because under the Turkish Empire all of it had been merged with Lebanon and Syria. It was not a particularly separate governmental unit. It was set up in order to take the first step toward carrying out the guarantee of the Balfour Declaration. At the time the Arabs did not raise any objection, and in fact their leader was in full accord with the plan. Nor was their position unreasonable. Palestine was only a very minute fraction of the total territory in which Arab states were established, and it was a territory in which three great religions had a profound interest. It was distinct from all other surrounding states.

Today a strong Arab opposition has arisen; but whether it is real or whether it is artificial, is indeed difficult to judge. Whether the British Government has encouraged it, whether those interested in oil development have encouraged it, I certainly do not know. I only feel that it is unreasonable and represents just as much a change of position on the part of the Arabs as that which has occurred in the British attitude. It does not weaken in any way the Jewish historical case.

Mr. President, for the sake of the RECORD I think I should review the history of what has happened to these resolutions.

The purpose of the resolution which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and I introduced in 1943 was to reaffirm the position of the United States with respect to what should be done in Palestine, and call upon the British Government to carry out the terms of the mandate. At that time, as today, there were thousands of Jewish refugees throughout the world who were seeking a haven, and they were excluded from Palestine not for economic reasons, but, allegedly, for fear that to allow them to enter might antagonize the Arabs. Many more wanted to go to Palestine. It is probably that if the policy of unrestricted immigration had been adopted at that time many lives would have been saved, particularly among the Jews of Rumania and Bulgaria.

An argument had also arisen regarding the meaning of the term “Jewish national home” which we thought should be definitely settled. We also felt that a general peace treaty was in sight and that the settlement regarding Palestine which would be made in that treaty might well be final.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate where it had the support of a large majority of the members of the committee. We were then very much surprised to hear that a letter had been written to the chairman of the committee by Secretary of War Stimson, objecting to the passage of the resolution on military grounds. This letter was backed up by the personal appearance of General Marshall before the committee. The committee was requested not even to hold public hearings, on the ground that the news of those hearings might so excite the Arabs in northern Africa as to interfere with our military operations which were then taking place in Italy.

I certainly did not believe that this was the real ground of opposition. I felt that the Army was cooperating with the British, and desired to please the British by not taking any position which it thought would be inconvenient for the British government. Certainly the argument advanced was not sound.

While dubious of the facts, the committee had no other choice than to accept the military judgment of our military leaders in time of war. But the committee was astonished a few days later when the President issued a statement that “Full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home, for which the Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy.” Surely, if the holding of public hearings by a Senate committee would have so stirred up Arabic public opinion as to endanger our armies, the issuance of this statement by the President, with his tremendous prestige, would have had even greater effect. But there is no evidence that the Arabs were in any way excited, or that there was the slightest interference with our armies then fighting in Italy.

The matter remained quiet until the Republican National Convention which was held in June 1944, called for the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and land ownership, so that Palestine might be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth. The platform stated:

We condemn the failure of the President to insist that the mandatory of Palestine carry out the provisions of the Balfour declaration and of the mandate while he pretends to support them.

Thereupon the Democratic platform, in July, endorsed the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic national commonwealth.

On October 12 Governor Dewey endorsed the Republican plank. On October 15 President Roosevelt endorsed the Democratic plank, and stated that “efforts will be made to find ways and means of effectuating this policy as soon as practicable.”

Immediately after the election the Senator from New York and I therefore pressed for immediate consideration of our resolution. I had obtained a letter from the Secretary of War stating that the military considerations which led to his previous action in opposing the adoption of the resolution were not so strong a factor as they had been, that in his judgment political considerations now outweighed the military, and that the issue should be determined upon the political rather than the military basis.

We were greatly astonished, therefore, when the then Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius, appeared before the committee and opposed the adoption of the resolution, apparently under the President's direction. This was all in secret. The committee insisted on proceeding to report the resolution unless the Secretary of State was willing to state publicly his opinion. This he finally did on December 11, 1944, after consultation with the President, giving as his opinion

that the adoption of the resolution at that time would be unwise from the standpoint of the general international situation. Even then the resolution was shelved by a vote of only 12 to 8.

Then President Roosevelt again endorsed the Democratic platform and stated that he would seek to bring about its earliest realization. I have never been able to see, Mr. President, why there should be any objection to a Senate concurrent resolution stating the position of Congress in accord with the traditional policy of the United States and of both parties. I have never been able to understand why the Executive should state his position and yet object to any expression by Congress of its opinion on this well established American policy. President Roosevelt repeatedly reaffirmed his position, but he always blocked a congressional resolution.

After this delay in the fall of 1944 the President took his trip to Yalta and talked with Ibn Saud. It was never clear to me why he should discuss the matter with Ibn Saud at all, since that potentate never did have any jurisdiction over Palestine, nor any right to be consulted about British and American policy therein. Yet the President apparently brought up the subject and failed to press it in any way when he met the unqualified opposition of the ruler of Saudi Arabia. He went even further, because he actually entered into correspondence with Ibn Saud in which he said that no decision would be taken by the United States with respect to the basic situation in Palestine without full consultation with Arabs and Jews, and more specifically that, "I would take no action, in my capacity as Chief of the executive branch of this Government, which might prove hostile to the Arab people." Apparently, Ibn Saud was treated as though he were the Arab people. It is hard to understand why the President should have considered it necessary to give any such assurance. The position of the United States had already been made clear. Mr. Roosevelt had pledged himself to this position. Why he should consult the head of a state with no direct interest in Palestine is and always has been a mystery to me.

Early this fall the Senator from New York and I called on the President to determine whether, if we resubmitted a resolution, we would meet the same opposition which we met from previous administrations. Mr. Truman indicated no opposition to the resolution and referred us to Mr. Byrnes. We pointed out that we did not desire to submit the resolution if there was to be administrative opposition. We were assured that there would be no such opposition, although the administration might agree with the British to a commission of investigation. Accordingly, we submitted the resolution. Unfortunately, for the third time we have met the opposition of the administration, although Mr. Byrnes assured us that he would have said nothing if he had not been called before the Foreign Relations Committee.

It is claimed that the appointment of a committee of investigation justifies

postponement of consideration of the resolution, but that committee was almost entirely arranged for when we first saw the President and Mr. Byrnes. I had no objection to the appointment of a commission to investigate thoroughly all the facts, but this appointment should not be made in such a way as to imply that the United States has in any way changed its basic policy. In fact, it seems to me all the more necessary now for Congress to express its view so that the American representatives may know what the policy of the United States Government is, and always has been.

Recently one other question has arisen which I think I should answer. It has been claimed that an attempt is being made to set up a theocratic state, a religious state. That certainly is not the purpose of the resolution, nor of the Balfour declaration. The Jews referred to in the declaration represent a race. The Jewish nation, which we hope may be established, will bear the same relation to the Jewish people throughout the world that the Irish Government bears to the Irish-Americans throughout the world, or the Italian Government to Italians who have left their homeland and settled elsewhere. The Jewish people are a race just as are all other races, but a race which has no country in which it constitutes the majority. There is no suggestion that the Jews of this country would have any closer relationship to this new Jewish state than that which a Norwegian emigrant, or the Norwegian-American in this country, feels toward the people of Norway, and certainly there is no thought or suggestion of establishing a religious state.

I have supported this resolution and propose to continue to support it, but I believe that the Palestine plan affords the only solution of the Jewish problem.

I might say that there is an additional factor which should be favored. The suggestion was recently made by former President Hoover that the great irrigation possibilities of the Euphrates and the Tigris Rivers in Iraq should be developed, and that Arabs who desire to leave Palestine be given the opportunity to do so and to settle on land which in ancient times was the most fertile land in the entire world. But that is something which would have to be added later to it, perhaps a way by which Arab opposition may be eventually killed.

Who have any alternative to offer? Palestine is the only place to which there may be transferred satisfactorily hundreds of thousands of Jews who are unable to return to their homes or remain in concentration camps or find homes in central or eastern Europe. In many of these countries, Germany, for instance, it would be very difficult for a Jew to return to the village or town in which he originally lived because he would have to live next to people who either were active Nazis, who actively persecuted the Jews, and perhaps killed members of his family, or at least people who acquiesced in the anti-Jewish program which formed the basis of the Hitler movement. They cannot go back to their former homes. There are other places in eastern Europe and central

Europe to which they possibly can return, and to which it is hoped many may return, but for the others there is no other haven, there is no other solution except that pointed out by this concurrent resolution.

I have supported the resolution because I believe we owe the best retribution we can give to the Jewish people who first bore the brunt of the Hitler attack, who have suffered the most intolerable tortures and the most frightful decimation, who fought bravely throughout the war, and have been among the strongest friends and supporters of the United Nations. I have supported it because I believe as a Nation we should keep our promises. I have supported it because I believe that the Jews, with the support of the mandatory power, could get on with the Arabs of Palestine and work out their own salvation. I have supported it because the solution of this problem will contribute as much to the permanent peace of the world as any other project before the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I express the hope at this time that my good friend the Senator from Texas will not insist—

Mr. CONNALLY. I know what the Senator is going to say, and I agree to it. If the leader wants to take up the day talking about Palestine and sidetrack the UNRRA matter, which we think is much more pressing, I agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry the Senator put his agreement in the terms which he did. I was merely going to suggest that he withdraw his motion in the hope that we may speedily dispose of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my motion. I cannot go up against the leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not making the request in my capacity of leader, but I do not see any reason why this resolution should take more than a few minutes in order to get a vote upon it. I understood that it was unanimously agreed last week to take it up today and dispose of it, and the appropriation based upon the UNRRA bill has already been made under the rule of the Senate that where a committee reports an authorization the Senate may go ahead and make the appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. That appropriation is contingent upon the enactment of House bill 4649.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and I think, if the Senator will permit me to say so, that we can dispose of both the resolution and the bill today.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DOWNEY. For 2 weeks the Federal pay bill has been before the Senate of the United States and it has been displaced or ejected or kicked around from day to day. I have in my hands here a typical budget—and I emphasize the word "typical"—of a man making \$5,000 a year in the Federal service and running a deficit of \$2,000 a year for which he is borrowing on his insurance

policy. Workers in the \$5,000 group have to pay 20 percent of their salaries for income taxes and depreciate the balance by 30 or 35 percent. The condition of this great group of Federal workers throughout the whole United States is lamentable beyond words, and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to do something to attempt to bring the Federal pay bill to a conclusion before the Senate of the United States. I have agreed—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that he will have my full cooperation in that matter so far as I have any influence with Senators, but I think we would get to his bill as quickly as possible if he will let me say what little I have to say about Palestine.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator yield to me for about 30 seconds?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have agreed with the Senator from New York not to call for the regular order until quarter after 1 o'clock. At that time I am going to call for the regular order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from California or any other Senator has the right to call for the regular order at any time, but I had hoped, inasmuch as we entered into an agreement the other day to take up the concurrent resolution and dispose of it today, that no technicality would be interposed to prevent that being done.

I wish to say a few things and will try to make them as brief as possible.

The Senate understands my position about this resolution, and the Committee on Foreign Relations also understands it. Long before I ever raised my voice in behalf of an independent nation in Palestine, long before I ever realized that there really was a problem, I formed a devoted friendship for a man, born and reared in my State, whom I regarded as one of the great Americans. He lived in Kentucky in his early youth and became a great lawyer and a great public servant before he was ever given any official position. Then he was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where he rendered outstanding service, and took his place among the great justices of that court. I refer to Mr. Justice Brandeis. I used to sit with him and listen to him talk about the problem of the Jew and the problem of Palestine. I visited Palestine some 10 or 12 years ago, and I could not help but contrast what it looked like then with the description I used to get of it when, as a boy, I attended Sunday school, where it was referred to as the land of milk and honey. It was far from a land of milk and honey in 1930 or 1935.

I shall not go into the long history of Palestine. It is, or was, the cradle of two religions, at least, the Jewish religion and the Christian religion, and it is now my belief, as it has always been, that if priority of occupation should have any right to consideration the Jew was entitled to prior consideration from the standpoint of sentiment, emotion, and history.

It is true that the Arab came in, and the Turks and various others conquered Palestine in time immemorial, so far back that the mind of man scarcely runneth to the contrary, but that has no bearing

upon the original history of Palestine and Israel. When World War I was in progress the Turkish Government, which controlled Palestine and all that part of the Near East, was lined up on the side of the Central Powers, Germany and Austria-Hungary. Turkey never became very active, but her sympathies were with Germany and the Austria-Hungarian monarchy.

During the progress of the war, in 1917, the Balfour Declaration was promulgated by Lord Balfour, then Arthur Balfour. I have forgotten the exact date of the declaration, but it was not very far removed from the date of our entry into the war, the 6th of April 1917.

The Balfour Declaration has been endorsed by every President of the United States from that time to this. It was endorsed by the British Government, of course, and it was endorsed by the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, and when the so-called white paper was promulgated in 1939, that document was unanimously rejected by the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations.

It has always been my understanding that the Balfour Declaration contemplated that immigration should be allowed into Palestine, looking forward to a time when the Jews would be a majority of the people, and when they should become a majority of the people, there was to be an independent commonwealth. That did not mean that everyone else was to be driven out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky permit a suggestion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. In view of the observation made by the Senator from California that he intends to ask for the regular order at a quarter past 1, and several Senators desire to speak on the Palestine resolution, I suggest that a vote be immediately taken so that the resolution may be adopted before a quarter after 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am hoping that the Senator from California will modify his suggestion about calling for the regular order at a quarter after 1, because there are a few Senators who desire to say something about the concurrent resolution, and I think both the resolution and the bill of which the Senator from Texas has charge will be out of the way by the middle of the afternoon, and the Senator can then have his pay bill resumed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Of course, the Federal pay bill was on the Senate floor long before this resolution and the UNRRA bill were, and hundreds of thousands of people, even millions, are vitally interested in it, I think probably more interested in it than in these other matters.

I may say that if there can be a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the Palestinian measure at 1:30 o'clock, and thereafter vote on the UNRRA bill at 2 o'clock, I shall not press whatever rights I may or may not have.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the suggestion of the Senator from California in the form of a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is nearly a quarter after 1 now.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished leader that I had a clear understanding—

Mr. BARKLEY. That we vote at 2 o'clock on the Palestine resolution?

Mr. DOWNEY. No; at 1:30 on the Palestine resolution, and at 2 o'clock on the UNRRA resolution. I may say that I had a clear understanding with the Senator from New York that if he was not through by a quarter after 1, we should proceed with our Federal pay bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not aware of such an understanding as that. I did not know the Senator was to call the pay bill up at a quarter past 1. I do not wish to take any time so as to deprive the Senate of the right to vote, and if we can get a vote now I am ready to yield the floor, but I am not going to yield the floor now and deny myself the opportunity to say a few other things I had in mind if nothing is to be accomplished.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky yielded to the Senator from California, and while yielding to him the Senator from California asked unanimous consent that the Palestine resolution be voted on at 1:30 o'clock and that the UNRRA bill be voted on at 2 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. HART. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the President of the Senate what are the orders and what are the arrangements which have been made with respect to the Palestine resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Palestine resolution is before the Senate by unanimous consent, granted December 13, the Chair is informed.

Mr. LUCAS. Does that mean that after we have agreed to take up the Palestine resolution any Senator may demand the regular order, while we are debating it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wonder if it is possible to get any sort of an agreement about voting.

Mr. HART. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HART. I have an amendment to the Palestine resolution I wish to offer, and I should like to have about 15 minutes to explain it, when the time comes to offer it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, obviously it is impossible to get any agreement, and if the Senator from California desires to call for the regular order, it is now a quarter after 1, and he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is Senate bill 1415, which is the unfinished business.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF  
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator yields, may I ask him a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if I can. It is now past the time limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from California will not object. My purpose in rising was to ask the majority leader and the minority leader whether in their opinion it would be possible to secure a definite understanding that the Palestine resolution shall be voted on some time this afternoon, say at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. The suggestion I had in mind, and I thought I made it to the Senator from California a while ago, was that the Senate vote on it at 2 o'clock, and I was going to follow that with the suggestion that we vote on the UNRRA bill at not later than 3 o'clock. I do not know how much time will be taken on the UNRRA measure, but no great amount of time will be lost to the pay bill by putting off the votes on other matters until 2 and 3 o'clock, respectively.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky make that as a request at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I incorporate it in a request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Chair state the request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is that the Senate vote on the Palestine resolution at 2 o'clock, and on the UNRRA bill at 3 o'clock. It will require a quorum call.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will agree to take not more than five more minutes.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. MORSE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, I may say that no one is more anxious than I to see the Palestine matter disposed of, and also to see passed the UNRRA bill, on the passage of which the appropriation recently made is contingent.

The Senator from Connecticut has advised us that he has an amendment to offer to the Palestine resolution, and he thinks it will take 15 minutes for him to express his views concerning the amendment. I wish to be assured in some way that the Senator from Connecticut will have an opportunity to present the amendment and to discuss it, and that he will not be precluded by an agreement now as to a time for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I can accommodate the Senator from Connecticut by yielding the floor instantaneously, and hoping that the Chair will recognize him for the offering of his amendment, I shall be glad to do that.

Mr. HART and Mr. MORSE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BARKLEY. If an agreement is entered into, I shall of course yield the floor at once.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am confused about this agreement. I merely wish to present my amendment and to explain it for 15 minutes. Whether I can conclude my remarks by a certain time depends on when I get started. I am ready now.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the agreement is entered into, I shall yield the floor and let the Senator proceed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall occupy the Senate floor at this time for perhaps only 10 or 15 minutes. I think that if Senators could but once be made to understand the critical and unhappy condition of the Federal employees, they would begin to take an anxious interest in them, just as they are taking an anxious interest in helping people in Europe and in Palestine. Apparently no one is very much concerned about expediting the Federal pay bill.

I think a majority of the Senate has been convinced that Federal workers receiving less than \$1,800 a year or less than \$200 a month are in rather critical condition. The distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in his last argument endeavored to convince the Senate that the increased cost of living had not disturbed the workers receiving the higher incomes. I have prepared for the Senate a typical budget of a Federal worker receiving \$5,390 a year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I fear that the Senator is misinterpreting what I said. I do not have the Record before me, but I believe I said, or I intended to say, that the impact of the increased cost of living does not affect the worker in the high brackets to the extent that it does the worker in the low brackets; that in the low brackets practically 100 percent of the worker's income goes for necessities; that as the bracket of pay becomes higher a lesser percentage of the worker's pay goes for necessities. I do not know what statistics the Senator now has, but I still think that statement of mine is substantially true, so far as the rank and file of workers are concerned.

Mr. DOWNEY. If I misinterpreted the declaration of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. President, I regret it. However, he has made his own explanation, and Senators realize what it is.

I wish to say that while this particular budget contains some unusual circum-

stances, every budget has in it unusual circumstances, but in its general result it is representative of the very desperate conditions of Federal workers in the upper brackets.

I should like to read this statement of the budget of a Government employee, and I might say that the particular man who gave me this story happens to be a very conservative Republican, and it is a typical story. This particular Republican has a very high regard for the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and was much shocked at the Senator's statement that he knew many men in the Government service who were receiving \$5,000 a year but were not worth more than \$1,500. This man says that in his opinion, from his own knowledge of his associates, the Senator's statement is totally erroneous, and injurious to public morale. I read the statement:

ANOTHER SAD STORY OF ANOTHER SAD  
GOVERNMENT WORKER

This worker entered Government employment during 1942 at an annual salary of \$4,600, having worked previously in a financial house outside Washington. Since then the basic increase of July 1, 1945, raised his compensation to \$5,180 annually and he has had one within grade promotion bringing him to his present compensation of \$5,390.

He is 40 years of age, has a wife and three daughters and is carrying insurance chiefly for their protection and the education of the latter at a monthly cost of \$60 or an annual cost of \$720.

Entire family enjoys good health but wife and daughters have required some medical, dental, and optical services during each year while in Washington at an average annual cost of about \$175.

Worker first rented a home in Washington and then was ejected because of its sale and to secure place to live paid \$11,500 for a home worth about \$8,000 at January 1, 1941, prices, an increase of over 40 percent its then value. Two thousand dollars down payment was made on purchase price and contract of purchase will now require about 10 years to pay out; and monthly cost of principal, interest, insurance, taxes, and upkeep approximates \$125 a month, or \$1,500 yearly. Furniture is still being purchased for new home.

Since entering Government service, the worker has been purchasing war bonds at the rate of about \$500 annually and has disposed of his automobile for approximately \$1,500. Bond purchases do not appear in budget.

In 1939 and 1940 worker paid no income tax while his payment for 1945 will amount to \$617.50.

The percentage disbursements for food, clothes, transportation, furniture, medical care, and laundry all follow about the normal pattern for workers in this income group.

The items included under miscellaneous cover movies and recreation, Christmas gifts, drugs, magazines and newspapers, travel and entertainment, and spending money for three daughters, two in high school and one in grammar school.

Worker is now financing deficit by borrowing on insurance policy and by cashing bonds. He regards his financial future with dismal foreboding.

This is his budget:

1945 Budget Federal worker, Washington,  
D. C.

Salary.....	\$5,390.00
Deficit.....	1,971.00
Increased cost of living.....	1,532.00
Increased taxes.....	617.50

Let us run over the items of this budget which I say are typical—and I am so told by the Bureau of the Budget.

First. Food. Annual current cost, \$1,320. Percentage increase over 1941, 42 percent. Approximate annual additional cost over 1941, \$390.

I want to emphasize to the Senator from Iowa that a Federal worker in the United States, wherever he is, could have bought the same amount of food for \$390 less in 1941 than he can now buy it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. According to the Government statistics he can still buy the same amount of food in the United States for approximately 30 percent over the \$500 to which I understood the Senator to refer, and not \$1,320 which is carried in this—what I consider to be an outlandish and exorbitant budget, and clearly beyond the means of a man who is receiving \$5,000 a year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Perhaps the distinguished Senator does not understand the budget, or I do not understand him. The total expenditure for food of a family of five is \$1,320 a year, or \$110 a month, and I might say the typical expenditure for food considered necessary for a family in that bracket is about \$100 more than that a year. Does the Senator say a family of five should live on \$500 a year for food allowance?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was merely replying to what I understood the Senator to say, that the same amount of food which cost \$1,320 in this budget could have been bought before the war for some three or four hundred dollars.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, no, Mr. President. It could have been bought for \$390 less. In other words, the extra cost for this same amount of food is \$390.

Item No. 2: Purchase of home, at price 40 percent above 1941 prices. It is true that only a portion of the Government workers have to buy homes at exaggerated prices, but those who do are generally men with two or three or four or five children who could not find apartments, and they have been caught in many cases for a 50-percent increase over the true value of the home as measured by 1941 prices. This worker has a much more sorry tale to tell than is told here. When he came to Washington he had to go to a hotel and live for a month or two at very high cost. Then he found a house and moved into it. He was later ejected by someone who bought the house. Then he went back to a hotel, and then was compelled to buy a house. As a matter of fact, I find a substantial percentage of the workers having large incomes and large families who could only procure accommodations by paying from 25 to 50 percent more for homes than they would have had to pay in 1941. This worker has paid \$2,000 on his home and is now paying for it over a 10-year period at the rate of about \$125 a month.

In other words, on this item he is caught with slightly more than a 40-percent increase over 1941. He has been buying some furniture for the new home at a cost of \$600 for the past year. That cost is up 46 percent. The cost of medical, dental, and optical treatment has increased approximately 40 percent. The cost of heat, light, gas, garbage disposal, and telephone has increased slightly. The cost of laundry and dry cleaning has increased 30 percent; and the cost of other items has increased as indicated in the budget. These items cost this worker a total of \$1,532 more than they would have cost him on January 1, 1941.

He could have surmounted that obstacle, but on top of that the Government requires him to pay income taxes of \$1,617. He is carrying an insurance program which costs him \$60 a month, and he must pay more than \$250 for a retirement annuity.

In addition, like approximately one-third of the people of the United States, he is supporting his parents. He had been contributing \$25 a month for the support of his parents, and a brother had been contributing a like amount. Because of the increased cost of living he had to increase the contribution to his father and mother by \$10, so the cost of that item is up 40 percent.

I am not pleading for any sympathy for this particular Federal worker. The truth is that because of an increase in the cost of living of 30 or 35 percent, and because of a 20 or 25 percent income tax upon salaries in the upper brackets, workers in the upper brackets have had their buying power cut almost in half. Does any Senator believe that a man who has created a standard of living commensurate with an income of \$5,000 or \$6,000 can easily accommodate himself to a standard of \$2,500 or \$3,000? If so, he deals differently with the values of life than I do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have just had laid on my desk the budget which the distinguished Senator from California is discussing. I notice that at the bottom of the column he comes to the conclusion that there is a deficit in this man's budget of \$1,971. From a hasty examination of the budget within the past few minutes I notice an item of \$1,500 a year for the purchase of a home. That is a saving. I notice an item of \$600 for furniture, which is counted in the annual budget. That is a capital investment, as is the purchase of the home. I notice an item of \$720 for insurance. That is item No. 11. That is a capital investment, or a saving.

Item No. 13 is retirement contribution. That item amounts to \$269, and it is counted in the budget. It is certainly a capital investment or saving.

Those four items in the budget total \$3,089, which is approximately \$1,100 more than the deficit. So the capital investment, ever counting the deficit, would show an accumulation to this man from that budget of \$1,100.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the budget minutely, but I merely call attention to the fact that

in the budget which the Senator from California is discussing there are many items of capital investment and capital savings which I feel are not quite apropos to the argument as to what the increased cost of living has done to Federal workers.

Mr. DOWNEY. I know that the Senator is inadvertently grossly inaccurate in his statement. There is an item here of \$1,500 for the purchase of a home. Certainly some of that payment is on the principal, but the major part goes for taxes, insurance, and upkeep. Of course, the item of principal is balanced by the depreciation of his house.

The Senator has entirely overlooked the real point. I am not appealing for sympathy for this particular worker. What I am trying to show the Senator by that item is that the cost of the home is 40 percent more than it would have been on January 1, 1941. The total increased cost of living, including income taxes, is \$2,149. That is just about the amount of the deficit established by this budget. Surely some of his expenditures are for insurance, and he is gaining some headway in the purchase of his home. But the probability is that after he shall have paid on his home for 5 years, he will not then be able to sell it for as much as he will still owe on the home 5 years from now, because by that time we expect that the value of the home will have gone down, not to \$8,000 but probably \$5,000 or \$6,000.

Mr. President, the point I desire to make is this: A man with an income of \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000 a year cannot have 20 percent of his income taken away in income taxes, have his cost of living increased by 30 or 35 percent, and his real purchasing power cut in half without being thrown into desperate straits. This worker is now running behind his income of 1941 by more than \$2,000 a year, although he now has an income of \$5,390.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know how generous and considerate the Senator is. Will not the Senator from California let us go ahead and act on the concurrent resolution and the UNRRA bill, and then take up his bill?

Mr. DOWNEY. Why does not the Senator ask unanimous consent for the passage of the UNRRA bill? I believe that every Senator is in favor of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some Senator might object.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not think any Senator would object. I believe that if the Senator were to ask unanimous consent to have the bill passed, it would be passed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. I believe that the same statement is true with reference to the Palestine resolution. An amendment may be proposed, but aside from that I think it would be passed almost unanimously.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not acting through any spirit of ob-

struction in regard to the bill of the Senator from California; but I believe that he would gain time if he would let us get these other matters out of the way. The minds of Senators are disturbed about all these questions, and they are not giving the Senator from California the attention which his remarks justify, and to which he is entitled.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am accustomed to that experience, so I am not unduly worried.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is the usual situation, I should like to offer the Senator a diversion and show him that we can listen to him. He can understand that, with Senators on the qui vive with regard to the other two measures, they cannot give him the proper attention.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me suggest to the distinguished Senator that with his prestige and diplomacy, if he could undertake, while I am speaking, to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on these various measures which would be satisfactory to all Senators, I should be very happy. Apparently the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has a speech which he wishes to make. I do not know on which of the measures he wishes to speak, or for how long he expects to address the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the Palestine resolution at a quarter to 3, and on the UNRRA bill at 3:30.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. A moment ago I stated that I was anxious to see both those measures disposed of, and I have no objection, and shall voice no objection, to the request that the UNRRA legislation, which came from the Foreign Relations Committee, may be promptly disposed of. I am compelled to ask assurance that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be given an opportunity to offer his amendment to the Palestine resolution and to speak in explanation of that amendment. If that assurance can be given, so far as I am concerned there will be no objection to considering either measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that that arrangement would allow a little more than an hour for the consideration of the Palestine resolution. I assume that the Senator from Connecticut would be recognized. I wish to speak for 5 or 6 minutes on the Palestine resolution. Other than that, I do not know of any extended speeches.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I would be willing to agree to set an hour to vote on the pay bill. We have three measures pending before the Senate. It may be that we can fix an hour to vote on all of them.

Mr. DOWNEY. I would be very happy to do so. I would be willing to make

an agreement to postpone consideration of the pay bill until tomorrow, upon the consideration that we begin to vote not earlier than 4 o'clock, the time between 12 and 4 to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator is that the pay bill, together with all amendments thereto, be voted on not later than 4 o'clock tomorrow, as I understand.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, and that the time between 12 and 4 o'clock tomorrow be spent without interruption on consideration of the pay bill and that the division of the time between the proponents and the opponents be handled by the Senator from Virginia, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to be associated with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART]. We are patrons of the same amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am heartily in favor of fixing a time for the Senate to vote on the pay bill. I may call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Senator from California has occupied a total of perhaps 4 hours or more on the pay bill—I say that without being in any way critical, for the Senator had a right to do so—whereas the proponents of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Connecticut, and myself have had approximately 30 minutes' time in which to discuss it. However, even in spite of the fact that unanimous consent to the proposed agreement or any similar one, by which the Senate would vote at a certain time tomorrow, would probably deny the proponents of certain amendments any time comparable to that already consumed by the Senator from California in advocating his bill, I still think the bill is so important that we should fix a time for the Senate to vote on it, and thus stop this most peculiar and, I think, most unparliamentary procedure in which the Senate has been indulging for 4 or 5 days. I think the Senate should reach a decision regarding the bill, and I am heartily in favor of doing so promptly. In fact, I think the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Connecticut, and I were prepared to propose such an agreement a little later. We would have proposed that the bill be voted on this evening. However, if the Senate is to proceed to consider other measures in the meantime, perhaps that could not be done.

So I join with the Senator from California in urging that the Senate fix a time tomorrow at which it will vote on the pay bill, and that provision be made for consideration of the pay bill tomorrow without interruption.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am prepared to move that consideration of the pay bill be laid aside until tomorrow, to be voted on at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, if it can be agreed that consideration of the bill will begin at 12 o'clock and will continue without interruption until 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capehart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdock	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### THE PROMISE OF AMERICA—PATRIOTIC EFFORTS OF AMERICANS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have read an article in This Week magazine which has caused me to pause and ask myself some questions. One of them is this: What is it that we have here in America that has the effect on our foreign-born citizens as shown in this article? The answer came clear.

America is the home of freemen. It is a land where they can go toward the larger life; freedom of mind, body, and soul.

That is why, during the American Revolution, Englishmen fought Britain. That is why, in two world wars, some of our most outstanding soldiers who were of German extraction fought the Kaiser and Hitler. The same is true of men of Italian extraction who fought on behalf of their new homeland. That is why men of Japanese extraction in this war made the proudest records of the war.

America does something to folks who come to our land. They find something on these shores that no other land possesses.

We call it liberty and freedom, Mr. President. Just what is it? It is faith realized. It is opportunity for growth of mind, body, and soul. It is equality before the law. It is living in a land where the Bill of Rights is vital and intact, and where the State is but the servant, and man's home is his castle.

Yes, Mr. President; this America does something to those who come to our shores. We want to make sure in these times of stress and change that we keep this "something" in America. We must not let it be lost. There are those among us who are eyeing foreign concepts, and wish to copy what other lands may have. We cannot let them dissipate this "something" about which we are talking today.

Mr. President, what was the article to which I have referred? I hold it in my hand. It speaks of the loyal and valuable service which was rendered to this country by the Nisei, the first generation of Japanese-Americans to be born on this soil. The article explains how the services of the Nisei saved American lives, and how MacArthur is finding them to be irreplaceable and beyond value.

Mr. President, Robert Burns has stated that "The man's the gowd for a' that." It is not the color of the skin but the quality of the heart which counts. May America never forget the significant fact that while we stem from many races we are one people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

**FINDING JAPAN'S HIDDEN TREASURE—THAT'S ONLY ONE OF THE MANY MISSIONS ACCOMPLISHED BY GI'S OF JAP ANCESTRY.**

(By Lt. Col. Wallace Moore as told to Don Eddy)

One crisp morning this fall, jeeps whirled through Osaka, Japan, and bore down on the city's most powerful bank, the Sumitomo Genka. Yanks in battle dress hopped out and surrounded the building.

At once, a staff car followed by other jeeps drew up at the main entrance. An American Army officer strode into the bank at the head of a strange company—a squad of soldiers, two unhappy Jap gendarmes, four plain-clothes members of the Japanese secret police, and four noncommissioned American Army officers with Japanese faces.

These latter four were boys from California and Oregon, American citizens of Japanese ancestry, members of the most remarkable and perhaps most valuable military unit we have in the Orient.

As babble inside the bank died, the officer proclaimed:

"The United States, in the name of the Allied Governments, seizes this bank. All employees will assemble before me immediately without touching the bank's resources, records, or documents. All persons not employed by the bank will depart at once." He beckoned an American-Japanese noncom. "Sergeant, you will translate my instructions."

The trim little sergeant repeated the order in crackling Japanese. Customers were ushered out. All employees, including the manager in elegant morning coat, striped trousers, and silk hat, were sent home. The doors were locked. And the Army had a bank on its hands.

**JAPS HID THEIR LOOT**

Not just one. Throughout Japan, at that instant, the scene was duplicated as 21 banks were occupied. But why? Because Gen. Douglas MacArthur knew that somewhere, in some secret place, the Japs had hidden \$250,000,000 of gold, silver, and platinum looted from southeastern Asia. It had to be found.

We hoped to recognize it from the records. But the records were in Japanese. Who could read them? Generally speaking, only one small group in our entire occupation force—the handful of gallant, loyal American-Japanese.

In the cavernous vaults of the Sumitomo Genka, the sergeants shed their blouses and tackled a mountain of records. Night came. They slept on the job. Toward evening of the second day one of the men called his mates. "Hey, guys, what do you make of this?"

It was an irregular entry concerning an enormous amount of money. They reported to their commander. Soon the bank was swarming with intelligence officers. Thus, the hidden treasure was found and another Jap plot foiled—thanks to men whose faces may be Japanese, but whose loyalties and instincts are purely American.

Behind this is a hitherto secret story of our desperate need for Japanese-speaking intelligence operatives when war impended, and how it was met by these boys called Nisei, or second generation—whose relatives we sent to relocation camps here at home.

We had intercepted the key Japanese codes. Decoding them was a monumental task. We had no more than seven individuals with any knowledge of the right dialects. Finding more quickly was literally a case of life or death.

We found them on our west coast—50 men of Japanese ancestry who wanted to fight for America. They became pupils in a secret language school established at San Francisco by Brig. Gen. (then lieutenant colonel) John Weckelring. All were made sergeants and assigned to intelligence.

At first, every GI was suspicious of them. That attitude changed to something approximating hero worship a few hours after the first three went into action at Buna.

We were in the jungle. Wriggling through the kunai grass between the lines were our Nisei, searching bodies of Jap casualties. One of the boys crept back with a scrap of paper. "It says," he reported, "the banzai attack is ordered for 7 o'clock tomorrow morning."

We deployed our forces accordingly and smashed the attack with almost no losses to ourselves. From that moment, the GI's took the little Nisei to their hearts. I can't use names of these men, since many are now engaged in dangerous undercover work in Japan, but there has never been a whisper of disloyalty on their part. It is no secret that several have been publicly commended by their commanding generals.

Toward the last of the Buna show the Japs were evacuating on barges. One day an enemy officer and several men walked toward our lines waving and shouting. Scores of Yank fingers were closing on triggers when a Nisei yelled, "Don't shoot! They're surrendering!"

The officer was a medic who, with his men, surrendered because their General Tanaka had ordered wounded left behind so he might be saved. "If that is bushido (chivalry)," the disgusted doctor said, "I am through with the war." He told us everything, even identifying his general's barge, which our air force promptly blew to kingdom come.

**PRISONER FEARED TORTURES**

In the Saldor campaign, somewhat later, we captured several unwounded prisoners. They would answer no questions at all. Loitering near their enclosure, one of our Nisei overheard one prisoner say he lived in Kochi. Our man had been in Kochi and struck up a friendly conversation. The prisoner burst into tears and confessed he was terrified. He had been told we tortured prisoners.

"I won't let them torture you," our sergeant promised. They continued to talk about Kochi. "You remember the house with the cherry trees?" Yes; the prisoner knew it well. "What time is the banzai attack tomorrow?" "Three o'clock," the prisoner said. "And do you enjoy the theater?" the sergeant went on. The prisoner never knew he had made it possible to save countless American lives.

I say flatly that our military intelligence in the Japanese war would have been impossible without these loyal American-born boys.

Australians fighting beside us also used our Nisei. They insisted, unwisely, that the Japanese-Americans wear Aussie hats for pro-

tection, and ordered that no Japanese in an Aussie hat was to be molested. The enemy heard of this and soon the jungle was full of Nips wearing Aussie hats. That order was quickly rescinded, and the Nisei put on their GI hats again.

Until we actually used loud-speaker systems to persuade the enemy to surrender, nobody believed they would work. We borrowed equipment from the Australians and used the first set at Hollandia. Our broadcasters were our American-Japanese. The sets would be prime targets for enemy bombardments, but not one boy hesitated.

A jeep carrying the equipment was hustled up an enemy trail and the voice of a little sergeant began bellowing surrender advice out of the amplifiers. Nothing happened.

We were getting discouraged when a live prisoner was brought in. We learned then that the Nips opposing us spoke the Kanto dialect, whereas our man spoke Kansai. The only possible broadcaster who spoke Kanto was our prisoner.

"Let me work on him," our Nisei sergeant said. He took the prisoner to see the tremendous strength coming ashore. The awed prisoner agreed to broadcast. The prisoner spoke through the amplifiers so convincingly that 35 Nips gave up.

This was the Army's first group victory through psychological warfare. It paved the way for mass surrenders of later campaigns, the ultimate capitulation of Japan itself, the saving of thousands of American lives.

When General MacArthur planned the raid to free Allied prisoners at notorious Santo Tomas prison camp in the Philippines, it was learned that Nip guards had been ordered to massacre all prisoners in event of attack. Who might persuade them to disregard their orders? Only someone who spoke fluent Japanese.

Thus, as other troops stormed the camp's approaches, gallant Nisei made straight for the captain of the guard and, heaven only knows how, convinced him the slaughter would bring horrible retribution. The prisoners were saved.

At Okinawa, American-Japanese worked with native farmers who pointed out enemy bastions for our forces to blast before they could do much damage.

In Japan, our Nisei (and we haven't nearly enough) form the bulwark of General MacArthur's military secret service. Our occupation army stands in a land where nothing is comprehensible. Thus our Nisei are our spearhead against Jap finance, politics, and propaganda.

When Tokyo Asahi, the powerful newspaper, blandly published false and vicious allegations of assaults by American soldiers on Japanese women, the ordinary GI couldn't even read them. But our Nisei could and did. Now a Nisei sergeant makes sure that Asahi is behaving itself.

All through Japan, our American-Japanese are listening, watching, understanding. When a Nisei sergeant reported that the government of Higashi Kuni was scheming secretly against the occupation, Kuni was ousted.

**THEY MUZZLED THE BENSHEI**

Their influence is felt even in the most plebeian places. Every Japanese movie theater has a man called a benshi who stands beside the screen to explain the cinema. A Nisei sergeant in a crowded Tokyo theater recently heard the benshi suddenly break into a vicious anti-American tirade. Next day there was a new benshi and all others in the empire had been ordered to stick to their dramatics. Left uncontrolled, they could be a powerful force of evil.

Finally, there is the colossal task of re-educating Japan in the ways of democracy. Every textbook in every school and college must be rewritten by individuals who understand democracy and also thoroughly understand Japan. No group can do this as well

as our Americans of Japanese ancestry. They have already started.

Whether we do or don't fight another war in the Orient, one fact is crystal clear. Our good Americans of oriental extraction constitute an asset of incalculable value, an asset we never could buy for money. Outspoken Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell said not long ago:

"These boys bought an awful big hunk of America with their blood. They have a place in the American heart, now and forever." The General said a mouthful.

**NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SEYBOURN H. LYNNE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, January 10, 1946, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphree, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

**ISSUANCE OF AMERICAN-INDIAN POSTAGE STAMP**

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Lawrence P. Swan, of Erie, Kans., urging the issuance of an American-Indian postage stamp with a picture of the late Senator and Vice President Charles Curtis in the center of it. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERIE, KANS., December 13, 1945.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We are asking of you as our Senator to lend your influence to the issue of an American-Indian postage stamp, it will be known as the American, with our late Charles Curtis' picture in the center of it.

Mr. Hannegan has been forwarded the description of the design. Such a stamp would be a tribute to the American Indian who has become an outstanding citizen of our great country, as well as to Charles Curtis.

Thanking you for any service that you may render.

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE P. SWAN.

**CREATION OF A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE**

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Leonard W. Mayo, president of the Child Welfare League of America, New York City, N. Y., together with a resolution adopted by the board of directors of that organization, urging the strengthening of services to children and the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter and resolution and that

they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,

New York, N. Y., December 11, 1945.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: A resolution which urges strengthening of services to children and the creation of a Federal Department of Welfare was voted at the December meeting of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America. At the request of the board a copy is sent to you.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD W. MAYO,  
President.

Whereas the public services for children so essential to the welfare of the community have been seriously weakened during the war, and

Whereas many of these services have never been developed to a degree consistent with American ideals and resources: Be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America express its concern that public services for children in local communities, in the States and in the Federal Government be substantially strengthened.

To this end it is urged that the governments of the several States give attention to the improvement of such services and to the improvement of all essential related services without which special services to children cannot be properly sustained. It is recommended further that the State governments give attention to more effective administration and coordination of the various public departments within their jurisdictions concerned with services for children.

In order to insure a more economic and efficient administration, coordination and leadership for the development of child welfare and related services within the Federal Government.

It is recommended that a Federal department of welfare, headed by a secretary of Cabinet rank, be established within which a closer administrative relationship of services for children could be realized, the strength of services already developed being preserved; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to Members of the Congress, to the governors of States, to the directors of State departments of welfare, health, and education, to appropriate Federal officials, and to the league's constituency.

**BILLS INTRODUCED**

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of Southern Aviation Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1695. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louis Runs Above;

S. 1696. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Left Hand Bull;

S. 1697. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Miles Two Crow; and

S. 1698. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Peta Zuha or Owns The Fire; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1699. A bill relating to the admissibility of foreign documents in custody of Allied authorities of occupation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

**SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—AMENDMENT**

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3603) to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS**

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "EMBARGO ACTS OF CONGRESS"**

Mr. MILLIKIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 205), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the document entitled "Embargo Acts of Congress," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document.

**INFORMATION FOR SECURITY COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION RELATING TO ATOMIC ENERGY**

Mr. HOEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 206), which was referred to the Special Committee on Atomic Energy:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to negotiate an international agreement with the other member nations of the United Nations Organization, such agreement if made, to be ratified by the United States only with the advice and consent of the Senate, providing in substance—

(a) That each of the member nations will continuously make available to the Security Council of the United Nations Organization all information in the possession of such nation relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy.

(b) That the Security Council shall at all times have the right to investigate and inspect, within any nation which is a member of the United Nations Organization, facilities and developments relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy.

(c) That in connection with matters relating to nuclear fission, the transmutation of atomic species, and the release of atomic energy, no member nation of the Security Council shall have the power of veto.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MANASCO, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. HOFFMAN, and Mr. BENDER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 608) to exclude certain lands in Deschutes County, Oreg., from the provisions of Revised Statutes 2319 to 2337, inclusive, relating to the promotion of the development of the mining resources of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 290) providing for the continuance to the end of June 1946, of the Navy's V-12 program, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### VOLUNTARISM VERSUS COMPULSION IN LABOR RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Voluntarism Versus Compulsion in Labor Relations, delivered by him November 17, 1945, before the American Trade Executive Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS OF OPA ADMINISTRATOR BOWLES BEFORE THE NEW COUNCIL OF AMERICAN BUSINESS, INC.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by OPA Administrator Bowles, before the New Council of American Business, Inc., New York City, December 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SUGGESTION OF NAVY ISLAND AS SITE OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—ARTICLE BY LEROY E. FESS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article suggesting Navy Island as the seat of the United Nations Organization, by LeRoy E. Fess, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that upon the understanding that we desist from further consideration of the Federal pay bill until noon tomorrow, we proceed to consider and debate it exclusively, and vote upon the amendments; that the time be divided between the proponents and

opponents of the measure, and that voting on the amendments to the bill and a vote on the bill itself commence not later than 4:30. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that certain members of the committee desire that the vote shall not be taken until 4:30. I suggest that the division of the time be as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] shall control the first hour, the chairman of the committee shall control the next hour and a half, the Senator from Virginia shall control the next half hour, the chairman of the committee shall control the next 15 minutes, and the Senator from Virginia shall control the closing 15 minutes.

I understand that the distinguished Senator from Oregon is perhaps prepared to make some objection to this suggestion. I wish to tell him that this measure is one which has been on the floor of the Senate for 2 weeks. It is being anxiously thought about by all Federal employees. If he desires time on this particular measure, I am sure that we can give him all the time he desires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree in accordance with the suggestions which I have made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I am perfectly willing to attend night sessions of the Senate every night this week in an endeavor to enable the Senate at least to catch up with its schedule. I think the Senate should hold night sessions on these pending matters because it is about to complete one of the most remarkable do-nothing sessions in its history. I think that during the last week of this first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress we should be willing to hold night sessions if necessary in order to pass some legislation which is of vital concern to our country.

I find myself in favor of the bill being sponsored by the Senator from California, namely the Federal pay bill. I find myself in favor of the Palestine resolution submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], as well as the UNRRA bill now proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Because of some unfortunate experiences over this issue of limitation of debate which occurred earlier in the session I also find myself very much in favor of seeing to it that unlimited debate shall prevail in the Senate of the United States. As I have said before, this forum must be maintained as an open forum with unlimited debate protected from steam-roller tactics in the closing days of a session of the Senate. For the reasons stated, Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill is before the Senate, and open to further amendment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I will continue my remarks on the Federal pay bill.

I think that the great diminution in the actual buying power of the Federal employees in the upper brackets is rapidly stripping away from the Govern-

ment service some of its best and ablest men and women and is creating a grave lack of efficiency in Government service.

I have already distributed among Senators a budget of a typical worker receiving \$5,000 a year. It indicates that income taxes, and the increased cost of living, have cut the employee's compensation by \$2,300, leaving him with an actual buying power, as compared with 1941, of about \$3,000.

I know that probably the great majority of the Federal employees will be compelled to remain in Government service. But I ask you, Mr. President, What kind of efficiency and loyalty can we expect of Federal workers when, as though they were lepers of some kind, they are singled out for the most prejudicial treatment that could be given any great labor group in the United States, and left in a precarious condition of insolvency? Under the critical financial conditions which confront them, should they be expected to demonstrate any high degree of loyalty and efficiency?

Mr. President, I know there are many Senators here who are alarmed at the great power of the strike. They desire—and all of us do—to adjust great labor disputes by mediation and conciliation. I ask you, Mr. President, What kind of an effect will be left upon the Nation when almost the only great group of workers which does not have the power to strike is dealt with as we apparently intend to deal with the Federal workers to whom I have referred?

The right of unlimited speech? Of course, we are all devoted to it. But certainly, where eminent justice is an issue, as well as the financial integrity of men, we should be able to work out some kind of agreement.

Mr. President, I have used some strong language when I have said that of all the great wage-earning groups the Federal workers have been the least fairly dealt with. Why do I say that? In 1940 the cost of living began to ascend, and we, the Senate of the United States, saw to it that the income of the farmer and the income of the industrial worker were protected, but we let 5 years go by, 5 years with the cost of living mounting, and the income of everyone else going up, before we so much as raised the basic income of the Federal worker by one single dollar. They were years behind every other group.

There are in this body, of course, wealthy men, who have spoken upon the Senate floor, and who have said that they are independent of their Government incomes. Can they not for a few hours at least begin to project themselves into the lives of the humble individuals, and know that each home is the center of a world, that in almost every home of these Federal workers the people live lives of quiet desperation? It is easy enough when one has an independent income, so that he does not have to worry whether his \$5,000 income is cut in two or not, to be placid and slow and happy about this matter.

We, the Senate of the United States, are on trial. If I were a labor leader and wanted to disrupt relationships of a conciliatory nature, nothing would suit me better than to be able to say to my

workers, "Well, see the Senate of the United States. The plainest and simplest thing is now before it, and it has not even energy enough to act upon the dispute."

Mr. President, last Saturday the last of many corporations, the Sinclair Oil Co., increased the pay of its workers by 18 percent over a prior 21-percent increase, bringing the oil workers to a much higher standard than we are asking for Federal workers in the bill. As a matter of fact, I do not know of a single labor dispute which has not already been settled at a higher wage allowance than is being asked in the bill. I do not know one single corporation, including the General Motors, which has not offered at least as much as we are asking for here, or more. Why should we single out the Federal worker for punishment and prejudicial treatment?

I know that Senators in opposition to the bill, including the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], have expressed the opinion that Federal workers are highly inefficient. I was saying on the Senate floor, when the Senator from Ohio, who has just entered the chamber, was not here, that I have presented this morning the budget of a Federal worker making \$5,390 a year, and by reason of the increased cost of living and the increased income tax his real buying power, compared with 1941, has been cut down to about \$3,000.

Mr. President, the condition of that man, who now is facing a deficit of about \$2,000 a year, and borrowing on his insurance policy, is not only typical of the great majority of workers, but is most unhappy indeed. That man happens to be a conservative Republican, and happened to express very high admiration for the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He said he had some legal training, and that he failed to understand how any distinguished statesman with a legal background could on the Senate floor make a general charge that he knew men making \$5,000 a year who were worth only \$1,500. I must admit that that kind of a generalized ex-parte statement shocks me also.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator deny that it is true? Does not the Senator know that some employees in Government service are receiving three times what they are worth, three times what they could get if they went out into private enterprise? It is no general charge against the employees of the Federal Government, it is true here, and my argument was made in behalf of a selective increase of salaries, not a general percentage increase for everyone, regardless of whether he was worth anything or not.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may tell the distinguished Senator from Ohio the opinion I get from men who entered the Government service from industry, men high in the councils of the Nation, who testified before our committee, the opinion I get from Secretary Patterson and Secretary Forrestal, the opinion I get from workers in whom I have confidence, that is, that there is about the same degree of inefficiency in Government service that is found in a lawyer's office or a doctor's office, in industry, or in the Senate of the United States. Certainly one can

probably point out 10 percent of Senators who some people would say are not worth anything, but I do not know how by generalized castigation one can justly attack the allowance of a wage sufficient to bring back the real buying power of workers as of January 1, 1941.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Iowa sought to interrupt first, and I yield first to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from California that by training and by personal opinion I dislike ex parte statements and quoting what this one and that one said to me, because I cannot repeat the names. I therefore also disapprove the budget referred to by the Senator from California because the maker of that budget is not here to be examined as to its details, and we cannot probe into the budget. But so long as the Senator has mentioned it, let me trespass for about a moment on his time to say, in support of at least a part of what the Senator from Ohio stated some time ago, that three individuals in the higher brackets of public employment in the civil service in the last week told me individually—and, so far as I know, they do not know each other—that they thought we were committing a most confusing and in many respects a most unnecessary act in providing for blanket increases throughout the civil service. They were very positive and definite indeed in their opinion as to the inefficiency of Government employment because of excess employees, because of inattention to duties, because of the desire on the part of department heads to reach out and gather in more employees so that they could make their departments larger and get more power.

About 4 days ago an official of one of the Government employee unions—I should not say a union, I should say an organization, because I do not recall that it is a union—came to my office, and of course prefaced his remarks by saying "For heaven's sake do not bring my name into this or I will be scalped." He said in my office that we would be committing, in thoughtless haste, an act which would have adverse repercussions on the Federal Civil Service, if we passed the bill as it is presently proposed, without adequate amendment. The advice of this official was that we should give a very substantial amount of study to it, but he said that unfortunately he was in such position that he did not dare appear before the Civil Service Committee. He said he was ashamed of it, but he did not dare express publicly his views of the facts he knew.

I again apologize, Mr. President, for using these more or less ex parte statements, but so long as that issue is injected into the discussion, I feel free to say what has come to my attention, in private, from Government officials, who feel that the bill as presented, without amendments being considered, is a dangerous measure, that it has not had

adequate or proper study, and that it should be given serious consideration, or we may commit an act which will confuse the entire civil-service system and destroy the efficiency of the Government workers.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before I yield, I desire to answer the statement made by the Senator from Iowa; then I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio. I assume he wanted me to yield on this particular matter.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it has to do with this.

Mr. DOWNEY. First, let me say, I am, of course, not so naive as not to realize that in throwing together a great organization of members of the military, with civilian members as well, amounting to fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen million, there would be a great degree of inefficiency. I know that at the beginning of the war some of these organizations had far more employees than they needed. I know many of them were submarginal workers because they were the only ones available. I know they lacked proper supervision. But we cannot take these new organizations, formed overnight, and fairly judge them as we judge the Standard Oil, which was formed back in 1867, or the Post Office or the Treasury Department.

I know that the present efficiency of my own office is at least twice what it was per worker when I first came into the Senate of the United States. Of course there has been overstaffing; of course there has been inefficiency; of course there has been waste motion. While I realize likewise that the Appropriations Committee has the entire power, acting, of course, with the advice and information of the Bureau of the Budget, to keep employment down to any figures it may desire, I know that that committee has a most difficult task, and probably very often is not entirely satisfied the results it accomplishes are correct.

I consider the Senate Appropriations Committee as one of the most able and most heavily burdened organizations I have ever known. It is a bipartisan group, working under the leadership of one of the most distinguished Senators we have ever had, and that group is working almost constantly determining the number of workers that should be in the Treasury Department, in the Department of Commerce, in the Army, in the Navy, in every one of the thousand or more Government agencies.

Under the classified civil service we have set up certain categories and certain ability and training standards are required before any man can get into any one of those categories. If what the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said is true—I do not think it is true—but if a man who has no higher qualifications than would justify his receiving \$1,500 a year is receiving \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year, that problem ought to be approached directly and not by way of resisting a pay bill which attaches the increased pay, not to the individual but to the office and to the standard set up after years of investigation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I made a rather mild statement in favor of selective increase and a study of this problem, in view of the fact that there had been an increase made in the last 6 months. I therefore propose a further study of the whole problem. The Senator has seen fit to compare this organization to a business organization. What does the Senator think a business organization would do in such a case as this? If a business organization faced an increase in the same proportion as this—which is an increase of approximately \$1,000,000,000—in its total pay-roll bill, such an organization would make a survey of the whole situation and if they could do with fewer men. They would regrade certain positions. They would determine how they could properly give every individual who was employed by them what he was entitled to, and still not increase the tremendous burden on their stockholders—or as it is in this case, on the American taxpayer. I say that there is a selective question involved.

I have a letter from the head of a bureau, one of the bureaus of the Department of Commerce, in Columbus, written December 6 from Columbus, Ohio, as follows:

I understand that there is a proposal before Congress to increase the compensation of civil-service employees by 20 percent. While I am not familiar with the rates of pay in agencies of the Government other than this bureau, I do believe that existing rates in this bureau are high enough for all full-time employees. But observers working on a part-time basis at substations are deserving of the proposed increase.

I feel strongly that every possible measure of economy in Government activities ought to be applied now, so that reduction in the public debt may begin as soon as the armed forces are fairly well demobilized.

I shall not give the name of the writer; it may make him unpopular with his fellow employees thus to have expressed his opinion.

Mr. President, I do not say that a general increase of some kind ought not to be made sooner or later; that employees who remain should not receive a higher salary. I only say that I do not see the immediate necessity for considering this question until something can be done to reduce the total bill, and some study made as to whether every employee's salary should be increased, or whether there were some positions which are very much overgraded; whether we should not investigate and determine whether some departments have jobs for which they are paying \$9,000 a year, for which only \$6,000 should be paid, whereas others may be paying salaries of \$6,000 a year for work for which \$9,000 ought to be paid. I do not know what the result may show, but after having provided one blanket increase, then before another blanket increase is made we should investigate to find out whether the increase will be above the cost of living in 1941.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it so happens that the Senator from Ohio, when I was not on the floor, made a most learned and very valuable argu-

ment, I think about 2 weeks ago, in which I was glad to note his declaration that in his opinion the depression of 1929 came on because of an excess of saving. I was glad the Senator made that statement. As I understood, the Senator also stated in that argument that he favored a sufficient increase to bring the Federal workers up to the increased cost-of-living standard. I might say to the distinguished Senator that in the main that is all the chairman is trying to do. What we propose to do will not quite bring those in the higher brackets up to the standard of living index, and it will do a little more for those down at the bottom of the group. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator is familiar with this or not, but when we gave the basic increase of 16 percent last year we gave 20 percent on the first \$1,200, 10 percent on the brackets from \$1,200 to \$4,600, and only 5 percent on the salary above that. That left those in the upper brackets with an increase of only 9 percent, and it left them 24 percent below the cost of living standard. We are not seeking any raise here. We are merely seeking to do what has been done for every possible wage group up to date, or has been offered, and that is only to restore the real buying power of 1941.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I think we have dealt rather severely with Federal workers in this debate. I think we have been a little bit too critical of our Federal workers, and I think at times we have been rather hasty in placing them in a category of inefficiency. It is true that there are inefficiencies in the Federal service, and occasionally it will be found—

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator said it was true, and that is all I ever said. I never made any general attack on the efficiency of Federal workers. I simply said there were some who were inefficient. I said we ought to do something about selective increases rather than general. I never made any statement that there was any general inefficiency of any kind among the Federal workers.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me resume the floor for a moment. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio a question, if I may. Would the Senator from Ohio justify examination into the personality of every one of the 96 Senators and say, "Well, the Civil Service Committee, or the Appropriations Committee, may determine that 10 percent of them are inefficient, and 10 percent are lazy, and 10 percent go haywire," and that therefore instead of attaching the \$10,000 to the office attempts should be made to parcel it out among the efficient individuals?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My answer would be that there may be departments in which there are too many high-salaried individuals whom the departments can do without, or, there may be departments which can

function adequately with but half the number of employees.

The Senator from California said the Appropriations Committee handles this matter. The committee does not. I was on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years. We practically never cut an appropriation made by the House of Representatives. This year the committee has been somewhat more diligent and has made a few cuts, but as a practical matter it cannot be done effectively without a study being made by the executive departments, which is what I would like to have done, indicating how they could reduce the total number of employees. They have to take the initiative, I think. My only suggestion is this: Because of the fact that there has been a recent increase, I would prefer to recommit the bill and have a study made before we make another increase. But I certainly will not vote against any proposal which I believe is only large enough to restore salaries to the increased cost-of-living level, because I believe in that and am willing to vote for it. But there seems to be a difference of thought as to whether the Senator's proposal does that or does more than that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Before the Senator leaves he will be given the opportunity to vote upon a raise which will do nothing more than meet the increased cost of living, plus a slightly higher increase for the workers in the lower groups.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California again yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I do not say that any individual arbitrarily charges the entire Federal group with being inefficient, but I make the statement that if anyone reads the RECORD of either today or any other day when the bill was under consideration I am sure he will agree that too much stress is placed upon the fact that there is inefficiency in the Federal service, and that too much stress is placed on the fact that this bill is brought before the Senate hastily, and that we ought to send it back to the committee, and that we ought not to consider the subject of a raise in the salaries of Federal employees at this time.

Mr. President, this type of argumentation may defeat the bill, and if it does defeat the bill it will be due to the fact that too many members of the Senate are stressing too often the inefficiency in the Federal service and offering no specific proof for it, and that too many Senators are stressing the fact that the bill has not been carefully considered. What are the facts?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Not now, Mr. President. I am going to make my statement now. I have been trying to do so for some time. After I have made my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, I care not what department of government we may consider, whether we consider an old department or an emergency agency, we will find in it, in my judgment, just as much efficiency, comparatively speaking, as we will in any industry throughout the country. If we consider some of the old

departments, we find much more efficiency that can be found in many private industries of the country.

We are told that the bill which is now being considered was prepared hastily. The bill was prepared for us by the administration, by the Civil Service Commission. Representatives of that agency appeared before our committee. The Civil Service Commission is responsible for the recruitment of the personnel of our Government. It had that enormous task throughout the war years. That agency recommended passage of the bill and pleaded with us to pass it. As a result, the bill is before the Senate with a majority of the Senators on the committee who considered the bill in favor of it.

The charge is made that there may be inefficiency here and there in the Federal service. As my argument against that charge, let me say that, first of all, in order to obtain a position in the civil service—in the postal service or any other service—an applicant must undergo a real civil-service examination. The test is severe, particularly in times of peace. It is not so exacting in time of war, when it is necessary to go to great lengths in recruiting sufficient personnel for the Government. At any rate, there is required a civil-service examination which is a real, bona fide one.

Once a person is in the service, he may be promoted, provided he has attained a suitable efficiency rating. Under various provisions of the law he may be promoted by progressive steps. That action is administrative. It is accomplished by the department and by the Civil Service Commission, under laws of the Congress which we helped to enact. Under the so-called Mead-Ramspeck law provision is made for a systematic method of promotion within grade.

So, Mr. President, a severe test as an entrance examination is prescribed for our workers. Efficiency ratings are applied administratively at regular intervals. We have a law which permits advancement within grades. I know of no industry which is more particular than is the Government in the selection of its employees. At a time such as this, pulling out of the hat charges against patriotic, loyal, conscientious Government workers may have a tendency to defeat the bill. Let me say in their defense that when they comply with the requirements of the civil-service system and the requirements of the law they demonstrate that, in the main, they are outstanding, loyal, conscientious, and faithful employees.

Mr. President, I believe that the bill has been properly considered. It comes to us with the recommendation of the Civil Service Committee, which not only considered the bill, but examined witnesses concerning it. It received the approval of the majority of the committee, and by reason of that fact is now pending before the Senate. Ever since the bill has been brought to the floor of the Senate one effort after another has been made to sidetrack it, refer it back to the committee, and find all sorts of weaknesses in it. The record with regard to the bill is one of proper, adequate con-

sideration. The bill comes before us recommended by the administration, by the Civil Service Commission, by the President of the United States, by members of the Cabinet, and by representatives of the employees' organizations, without a single objection.

Mr. President, I believe that we ought to consider the bill provision by provision, on its merits, and we should not be discussing the inefficiency which may occur here and there in isolated instances. If there is any way to perfect the bill I believe that we ought to decide now to put our minds and hearts to the task and do it, rather than set the bill aside and send it back to the committee, or do something else to forestall final action on the bill.

I conclude by saying that the bill is hereafter going through the proper parliamentary procedure prescribed under the law. I dislike the insinuations which have been injected into this debate, which might lead some to believe that inefficiency in the Federal service overbalances efficiency. I know from my own observation that there is as much efficiency, as much administrative ability, and as much loyalty and conscientiousness in the Federal service as there is in any other service in the United States.

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. For what purpose?

Mr. BYRD. For a quorum call.

Mr. BROOKS. Very well. I yield for a quorum call.

Mr. BYRD. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Huffman	Pepper
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Russell
Brewster	Knowland	Saltonstall
Brooks	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lucas	Stanfill
Capehart	McCarran	Stewart
Capper	McClellan	Taft
Carville	McFarland	Taylor
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gossett	Mitchell	Wherry
Green	Moore	White
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hart	Murdoch	Willis
Hayden	Myers	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	Young
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BROOKS. For what purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me inquire as to the nature of the request the Senator has in mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up a bill. It will not interfere with the Senator's speech; he will be able to speak, anyway.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator will not lose the floor.

Mr. BROOKS. Very well; that is the only thing with which I am concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4649, the UNRRA bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

ANALYSIS OF TERMS OF PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I propose, with the indulgence of the Senate, to attempt today a discussion of what I believe to be the most extraordinary agreement ever proposed between two nations. For the sake of continuity, I respectfully request that I be allowed to proceed without interruption until I conclude these remarks, and then I shall be very glad to be interrogated or to enter into a discussion.

The agreement which I wish to discuss is one which I can liken unto nothing so much as a great international game of chance in which the United States is to furnish the money for both participants and in which the British Labor Party is to furnish the dice.

Like all of the fantastic enterprises into which we have been drawn before and since the war, this one is being sold—to the American people, of course—with the same pretensions of altruistic concern for the world, mixed with some supposed benefits which we are to obtain. I take it, therefore, that I would do well at the outset to state as clearly as I can precisely what this proposal is.

There are two separate agreements.

One of them is for a definitive settlement of our lend-lease claims against Great Britain. The other is an agreement with Great Britain in which we undertake to make the British loan. The first agreement provides that England, in full liquidation of all her loans of arms and supplies, as well as cash, under the general term of "lend-lease" is to pay us \$650,000,000. That also will pay us for the surplus property belonging to the United States and still remaining in the United Kingdom. However, Great Britain is not going to pay us the \$650,000,000. It is to be settled in the future, as stipulated in the agreement.

The second agreement provides for an outright loan of \$3,750,000,000 by this Government to the Government of Great Britain. This loan is to be repaid to us in 50 annual installments beginning in 1951, at an interest rate which amounts

to 1.62 percent. On its face, the loan is at 2 percent; but since no interest is to be paid during the first 5 years, the net interest that will accrue to this Government will be 1.62 percent.

In return for this, Great Britain undertakes certain obligations. The most important of these have to do with a proposed agreement which it is supposed will, in the words of President Truman, "put an end to the fear of an economically divided world; will make possible throughout the world the expansion of employment and of the production, exchange, and consumption of goods; and will bring into being for the first time a common code of equitable rules for the conduct of international trade policies and relations."

Stated more specifically, the proposal is that Great Britain will make an end of, or at least enormously modify, her policy of empire preference, and that the United States and Great Britain will attempt to remove as far as possible the barriers to international trade which are described as tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document which I am discussing. In other words, it involves an understanding between these two governments that not only England but the United States will begin to open its doors to the products and merchandise of all countries, upon the theory that this is essential to the rehabilitation of the world and the creation of an era of prosperity.

The other agreement is that the British will take measures to unfreeze some \$14,000,000,000 of blocked sterling in the so-called sterling bloc of countries, in order to free these credits and to enable the countries in which they are blocked to resume multilateral trade operations.

Let me say a word about the first of these agreements, namely, the settlement of lend-lease. I do not have the precise figure, but I can say in general terms that the goods and services advanced to Britain under the lend-lease policy had a value in round numbers of \$25,000,000,000. When that policy was adopted, we were told we would not make the mistake we had made in the First World War—of lending money to Great Britain—because the First World War proved that she could not repay such sums. We would, therefore, lend her certain goods and materials, arms, and munitions. We were told that all this would come back to us, or most of it; that England and our other allies would be able to pay back to us goods and merchandise—products of their factories, farms, and mines—when the war ended and that this would actually aid their people then. At that time, I argued that that was a wholly dishonest assertion to make to the American people.

After the last war, England was enormously more sound economically than she is today, but she could not pay a loan of \$4,000,000,000 then. It was perfectly obvious that if another such loan was made, she could not—and certainly would not—pay it, but it was equally obvious, nevertheless, and we warned at the time, that neither England nor any other country would be permitted to send goods

manufactured abroad into this country to compete with the products of our own workers. Of course, what we predicted has come true, but the American people apparently have not yet completely grasped this fact.

Up to this minute, I am sure the American people who have not had the time to read these agreements imagine that we are going to be paid for what we gave to our allies during the war.

I wonder what they will say when the truth dawns on them—that under this agreement they are going to be paid \$650,000,000 for \$25,000,000,000 worth of material and installations. If you will compute that quickly, you will find that it comes down to a settlement of 2½ cents on the dollar. So far as I am concerned, and considering the generosity of our internationalists when dealing with England, I am amazed that our negotiators exacted so much. I have not the slightest doubt that before this episode is ended it will be called by the British a "hard settlement"—and it was called that just the other day—and perhaps another instance of the financial depravity of old Uncle Shylock.

However, it is not so hard if we will look at it a little closer. This \$650,000,000 settlement of a \$25,000,000,000 claim, this paying off of a debt of a dollar with 2½ cents, has certain features which mitigate its severity. First of all, it is divided into two parts. The British are to pay \$118,000,000 for all the lend-lease they received after VJ-day. The remaining \$532,000,000 is to settle all lend-lease advances before VJ-day, and also to pay for all American surplus property and installations located in the United Kingdom and owned by the United States Government. Mr. President, in the preparation of this statement the stenographer inadvertently interposed the figures. They are correct as I have just given them.

As a matter of fact, when we come down to it, England is really paying a very small sum for vast stores of property, magnificent airfields, and great installations which cost billions, and which she still has and can use and, as to some of it, can sell. I wish to congratulate those distinguished Americans who have been looking after our interests in this agreement for the manner in which they have guarded them, for I note with great relief and satisfaction that the agreement provides that England cannot export any of this surplus property back to us.

There is another feature of this amazing agreement which I know will please those whose hearts beat so warmly for the plight of people in other lands. I cannot quite make out how this money is to be paid, but I want to call the attention of Senators to this almost unbelievable agreement. First, England will pay this money in sums of \$50,000,000, to be paid every now and then, no time specified; but whenever before December 31, 1951, old Uncle Shylock demands a payment—whenever he does this—he will notify the British and they will transfer to him pounds sterling to an aggregate dollar value not in excess of \$50,000,000.

And what will we do with this \$50,000,000? Will we bring it back here and use it to do a little rehabilitating in our own land—perhaps pay some of the obligations we owe our own soldiers, perhaps do a little something in the way of relieving the unemployment which seems to loom ahead, or perhaps increase the pay of Federal workers about whom we have heard much debate. Oh, no. Here is what we have agreed to do:

The Government of the United States will use these pounds sterling exclusively to acquire land or to acquire or construct buildings in the United Kingdom and the colonial dependencies for the use of the Government of the United States—

In other words—I break off this quotation for a moment to make sure that Senators realize its meaning—we will never take that \$50,000,000 out of the United Kingdom, we will use it to build such things as we will want in the United Kingdom. I do not know what we are going to want to build there that will cost \$50,000,000, now and then, but that is the agreement. I now resume the quotation because I do not want Senators to miss this. There is another purpose for which we can spend the money, which is—

and for carrying out educational programs in accordance with agreements to be concluded between the two Governments.

This, mark you, Mr. President, we do not have to do in the United Kingdom, but it means that a part—and doubtless a large part—of this \$650,000,000 is to be spent by us in carrying out educational programs in combination with England.

Here, I want to amend the observation with which I started. I said that this is a game of chance in which we will furnish the money and the British will furnish the dice. I think history has taught us that in any educational program carried on by ourselves in cooperation with the British, we will furnish the money and the British will furnish the teachers.

What are these educational programs? What are we going to teach? To whom, and to where are we going to carry these adventures in propaganda? To Asia? And whose system of economic government are we going to propagate? Is it to be the system of private property and republican free government of the United States, or the planned society and socialist government of Great Britain? Certainly, whatever is done with this agreement, that incredible—that obnoxious—provision should be stricken from it.

One thing, however, is certain to come out of this lend-lease settlement. Little or no part of the \$650,000,000 will ever come to the United States. The whole settlement, so far as that agreement is concerned, is a pure and unmixed fraud upon the American people.

The second agreement provides for new loans amounting to \$3,750,000,000, to be paid back in annual installments beginning 5 years from now and covering a period up to 50 years from that date.

The first we heard in a concrete way about this now completed agreement came on September 13, of this year, after John Maynard Keynes, now Lord Keynes, arrived in this country in advance of the mission which has reached

its present result. Of course, all Senators know Lord Keynes. He was simply Mr. Keynes when he came to this country in the middle thirties and introduced our administration to the scientific theory of mass spending and deficit financing by the Government. Up to that time our Government had been spending money in a desperate effort to stem the depression and on the theory that they were "priming the pump." It was not, of course, working, and in 1937, when President Roosevelt began to talk about once again balancing the budget and actually to attempt it, we were treated to what was called a recession. We had seven or eight million people out of work; the spending was not a success; none of the fundamental defects in our economic system had been corrected; nothing was keeping the administration afloat but the indiscriminate spending of public money borrowed from the banks, and the President decided that he had better taper off the spending, cut out the borrowing and balance the budget—and down went the New Deal into its recession.

I am sure that at that moment there must have been some troubled hearts among the statesmen in this Chamber and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Just about that time John Maynard Keynes came here and assured our leading statesmen that the spending they had been doing was all right, that it was not just a "hit and miss" strategy of bewildered politicians, but was actually a profoundly scientific procedure, and that the only trouble with it was that they were not spending and borrowing enough.

And so was born the new theory of the New Deal which appeared among us in 1938 of the permanent deficit—the endless borrowing upon the theory that a Government debt is not like a private debt, that we owe it to ourselves, that we need never pay it, and that the interest on it is not a burden because we merely take it out of the right-hand pockets of the people in the form of taxes and put it back into their left-hand pockets in the form of interest.

This same John Maynard Keynes had been preaching that theory in England. He had gotten himself elected to the position of director of the Bank of England. He was later elevated to the House of Lords, and sent to America to negotiate this present agreement. I congratulate him. Any man who can settle a debt of \$10 for 2 cents is good, and deserves the admiration of all financiers and the thanks of at least his countrymen.

He arrived here in September and he told us he was here to make some kind of an arrangement about lend-lease, and about some way of helping England struggle out of her economic difficulties. But there was one thing he wanted to make plain to us. That was that Britain could not afford to make a commercial loan in this country. To quote him, he said:

No doubt an easy course would be for you to offer, and for us to put our name to a substantial loan on more or less commercial terms, without either party to the transaction troubling to pay too much attention to the question of the likelihood of our being

able to fulfill the obligations which we were undertaking.

The New York Times said:

Not only did he fear that the deception would probably have a very short life but it would be extremely shortsighted if the absence of friction and bad feeling between the two countries is one of the principal aims.

However, this may be—

He said—

we shall not lend ourselves to any such soft and deceptive expedient.

He continued:

We are not in the mood, and we believe and hope that you are not in the mood, to repeat the experiences of last time's war debt. We would far rather do what we can to get on as best we can on any other lines which are open to us.

What did he mean by a "commercial loan"? He meant a loan of money made to his Government to be paid back with interest on it. In the meantime, Lord Keynes said that his Government was in "no mood" to enter into such a transaction. He said it would be a "false start," that its terms could not be fulfilled, that it would have "a very short life" and would lead to nothing but "friction and bad feeling" between our nations—and so he said "no commercial loan."

That is what he thought. Lord Keynes, well as he knows us, just did not know who he was dealing with. He might have thought that England would not borrow money from us, but he was bargaining without us. If he thought that England could get away without a loan of billions from us, he now knows he was mistaken. Anybody can borrow from us. We are now talking about a loan to Russia, and we want it understood that neither England, nor Russia, nor Lord Keynes, nor anybody else can escape borrowing money from us if we want to lend—and we want to lend to anybody and everybody.

After Lord Keynes arrived in this country, he began negotiating for some kind of deal, apparently, which would not be a commercial loan.

In short, what Lord Keynes wanted and what the English wanted was what they call a grant-in-aid. In other words, they wanted money as a gift and without any preconditions that it was to be a loan, or that they were to pay interest on it, or even pay it back.

Sydney Campbell, financial editor of Reuter's, said, in July:

One thing should be made clear about the present discussions in the United States about a loan of three to five billion dollars to Britain. Britain would almost certainly refuse any such loan, however big it might be or however low the interest. British official and business circles are virtually unanimous that Britain is not interested in converting sterling debt into dollar debt or in adding dollar debt to existing sterling debt. They are rather mystified as to why Americans trouble to discuss the matter. A grant-in-aid would, of course, be accepted. Britishers would regard that in terms of the United States and possibly others of the United Nations taking over their fair share of the common war debt, which is at present piled on Britain's back alone. In return for such aid, Britain would be only too glad to make what Americans would regard as concessions in regard to freeing sterling and mitigating the exclusivity of the sterling area.

Now, I call attention to the fact that this man, the editor of a leading financial journal, says that British official and business circles are "virtually unanimous" that Britain is opposed to the kind of arrangement that is now offered to this Congress. In other words, this Congress is now being asked to approve a loan to Great Britain to which the then official and business elements of Great Britain are opposed to.

I cannot help commenting on their more or less generous attitude toward us in being willing to accept a grant-in-aid. We know what grants-in-aid are—they are gifts—we used the term during the period of relief to describe what we call grants-in-aid to our States. But note the reason which Mr. Campbell gives for Britain's being willing to accept this grant-in-aid. He thinks that giving Britain, on top of the \$25,000,000,000 of lend-lease, another three or even five billion dollars would be a "taking over of our fair share of the common war debt." Do our British friends think that we have not borne our fair share of the war debt?

I learn from the Bankers Insurance Magazine of London that between the beginning of the war in 1939 and its end on August 25, 1945, Britain borrowed in England fifteen billion in bonds which is \$60,000,000,000. We in this country borrowed \$230,000,000,000 in the same time, or nearly four times as much as Britain borrowed, although our population is not three times as great.

I call attention to the fact that we borrowed \$25,000,000,000 in this country and spent it specifically for the benefit of England, through lend-lease, much of it in the British Empire which is almost one-half as much as she borrowed herself for her own interest. I should think that if there was to be any adjustment of this situation by which each country would bear its fair share of the debt, England should be making us a grant-in-aid. However, this is not the point I started to make—what I want to call attention to is Mr. Sydney Campbell's testimony that the "official and business" opinion of England was practically unanimous in July that such an arrangement as this ought not to be made.

In September, about the time that Lord Keynes came here, the New York Times carried a dispatch from London, September 9, saying:

It can now be stated with assurance that he (Lord Halifax) and Lord Keynes will tell the United States officials that the American offer of a 2½ percent dollar loan is not acceptable as it stands. \* \* \* Badly as the British need help they are determined neither to beg for it nor to sacrifice their social and world trade program, which they firmly believe to be sound and just.

In another dispatch to the New York Times, on August 13, 1945, John H. Crider stated that Mr. Will Clayton, our Assistant Secretary of State, was in London sounding out the new Labor Government and trying to find out "whether the new British Government would consider such credits." Apparently our Assistant Secretary of State was in fact trying to sell the British this idea, but the same

dispatch said that the Churchill coalition government felt that such a loan "would only add to Britain's huge external indebtedness, increase the strain on exports and merely postpone the day of reckoning."

Now the matter has come before the British House of Commons. Mr. Churchill and the Conservative leaders urged their followers not to vote on the measure thus disapproving its terms. However, 50 of the party members, not satisfied with a mere silent protest, voted in the negative against the proposal. There were 38 other votes against it. But the vote by which it was passed does not represent the true opinion of the Commons. The New York Times said that even the Attlee-Laski Socialist members suffered a revolt and that many of them voted for the measure only under the party lash. Mr. Churchill said the British had "gotten the worst of it both ways." He meant that Britain had to take a commercial loan with interest and had also to agree to join in the Bretton Woods pact and to agree to changes in her export policy and to hand over dollars so soon that he felt the proposal would defeat itself. He said, with a true Churchill flair for epigram, "It is—in fact let us hope—it is too bad to be true." He objected to the indecent haste with which the proposal was being jammed through the House. And I think we may say that we have seen enough of the same kind of indecent haste in jamming projects of tremendous import through these Halls and that this pact will not be approved until the American people have had a chance to know what is in it.

Of course, there would have been no objection to this plan if the American Government had offered Britain a free gift of four or five billions. Last week apparently our Government would have been willing to do that. But we were informed by the morning papers last Thursday that Mr. Hugh Dalton, Labor Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in Commons that the American Government would not do that because our negotiators thought it would not be practical politics and because Congress would oppose it. But I might say to Mr. Dalton, in passing, that our negotiators did everything they could to comply with that request. And if he will examine the agreement more narrowly he will see that our negotiators inserted into the agreement several little jokers, the effect of which may well be to make this an interest-free loan, and perhaps ultimately a gift.

I notice also that Mr. Robert Boothby, a Scotch member, has denounced the loan. Mr. Boothby is not a hard-shelled conservative. He was once Mr. Churchill's Parliamentary Secretary. He is now the leader of the young conservatives in the House, where he has taken an advanced stand in favor of a planned economy and even the Beveridge plan. He seems to me to be pretty close to a British New Dealer. But he is a New Dealer who thinks in terms of his own country. He came to this country and urged strongly against any sort of loan to Britain. He has now repeated these warnings in the House of Commons where he said that this loan,

for Britain, is "an economic Munich; the greatest economic defeat we have ever had." And so we see that while this arrangement can do nothing for us save drain away from us immense sums of money and add to the weakness of our public fiscal position and give another push to inflation, there are some Englishmen who do not like it any better than some of us do.

Now, I ask, if Englishmen—Englishmen who are patriots and who are profoundly interested in the welfare of their country—Englishmen whose ideas of economic organization are far closer to ours than those of the Attlee-Laski Government—if such Englishmen, much as they see the dire needs of their country, can say to us plainly: "We do not want such a loan, we think it will not help us, we think it will add to our troubles, we think it is putting off the day of reckoning, we think it will increase the frictions between your country and ours,"—if such Englishmen can say those things to us, how can we delude ourselves into such a notion that we are doing a favor to England by forcing upon them a loan in which, in spite of all their troubles, their better judgment tells them they ought not to become involved?

Now, either this is a commercial loan or it is not. So far as the documents go, as I have said, it is obviously a commercial loan just as much as the loan one makes when he goes to his bank. Certainly, the interest is unreasonably low, but it calls for repayment in both principal and interest. But can it be that in spite of this pretentious appearance of being a commercial loan it is not one after all? Can it be that on its face it is a commercial loan but that actually the American people are being artfully and cunningly deceived again? A close examination of this document indicates that it will be very easy for England to escape paying either interest or principal whenever it suits her purpose.

In other words, the document is full of holes. They are called escape clauses—that is to say, they are clauses through which England can escape her share of obligations. For instance, England can at any time request the United States to waive the amount of interest due in the installment of that year. The United States will grant this under two conditions: First, if the Government of the United Kingdom finds that a waiver is necessary in view of exchange conditions, the United States then must grant the waiver. In other words, the United Kingdom makes the request for the waiver and then the United States submits the matter to the judgment of what is supposed to be an impartial judge. The impartial judge in this case is also the United Kingdom. In other words, the United Kingdom makes the request for the waiver and if it decides that exchange conditions are not favorable, then the United States must grant the request and apparently has no discretion in the matter.

The second condition is that the United States must grant the waiver if the income of the United Kingdom, from its exports and its invisible current transactions, was, over a period of 5 years, less than the imports during 1936-38. That sounds a little complicated, but the fact of the matter is that there is a most excellent chance of this being true almost every year in the troubled times ahead of England. There is very good ground for saying that the escape clauses in this document are so wide and inviting that we can scarcely look for Great Britain remaining incarcerated in this agreement for any considerable period of time. Some might say that the British are trying

to pull the wool over our eyes, but I do not subscribe to that theory. I think the British in this negotiation are looking after themselves. I think that somebody ought to be looking after America. Apparently nobody has been looking after America. The men who negotiated this agreement with Britain understand this as well as you do and I do. I think we are having the wool pulled over our eyes, but I do not think it is being pulled over our eyes by the British. I think it is being pulled over our eyes by the men who are misrepresenting America again and sacrificing the interests of this country to the interests of another country—for some reason which I do not undertake to understand.

Now, Mr. President, there are two things about this agreement which should doom it as far as the Congress is concerned. The first is that the conditions upon which it is based are such that neither England nor the United States can carry them out. The second is that the United States is assuming an obligation in terms of dollars which will put a strain of the first magnitude upon our resources. Let me consider these in order.

The first of these obligations is that neither Great Britain nor the United States can carry out the obligations they assume as a condition of the agreement. There are a number of such impossible conditions, but I refer in particular to one. It is stated that the great objective is to set in motion again the currents of multilateral international trade. I read from the joint statement which accompanied the agreement:

To this end (that is the reestablishment of freer international trade) they have undertaken to begin preliminary negotiations at an early date between themselves and with other countries for the purpose of developing concrete arrangements to carry out these proposals including definitive measures for the relaxation of trade barriers of all kinds. These negotiations will relate to tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States and referred to above.

I do not wish to go too fully into this. I hope at some future time to discuss it in detail, but I think we ought to be clear about just what we are getting in for. This agreement, if we conclude it, is a solemn pledge on our part that we will undertake a major operation upon our whole tariff policy.

About that, I want to say two things.

First, I want to call the Senate's attention to the fact that the old problem of tariff and free trade has become enormously changed. The old arguments about building up industries, and that sort of thing, are no longer relevant. Today, the Administration has set out by law to produce in this country a standard of living very much higher than that which existed before the depression. The Administration has announced its intention to assume the responsibility for full employment, for the security of every man and woman from the cradle to the grave, and in order to accomplish this it has formulated a program of government control of industry on the most

elaborate scale. This policy has been in the making for a number of years. We are now imposing enormous taxes for these purposes upon our producers. We force old-age and unemployment insurance taxes. We have compensation insurance and factory inspection laws guaranteeing working conditions matched no place else in the world and costing huge sums. We have instituted rules and regulations controlling our banks, our investment institutions, our producing agencies. We have imposed the will of the Government upon the employer-labor world which has resulted in higher wages, shorter hours, working conditions, even the terms and amount of production which have sent and will continue to send the cost of production in America to very high levels. I am not now discussing the wisdom of these things—I say they are a fact and every man knows it.

Mr. President, you know, as well as I do, that we cannot impose these kinds of cost and production elements upon Brown in Illinois and not impose them on Smith in Virginia. Both are entitled to compete upon the same level. We recognize that. But does anyone mean to tell me that we are now going to force both Brown in Illinois and Smith in Virginia to submit to these extensive controls and cost elements and then let some man from India, upon whom we cannot impose these controls, or someone in Britain or France or any other country whom our laws and regulations cannot reach, send their goods in here and compete with Brown and Smith? Whether it is right or wrong, wise or unwise, the American people will not permit that to be done and if attempt is made to throw down our trade barriers in order to open our markets to a flood of products from these low-income, low-standard, low-cost countries, every manufacturer in America, every trade union in America, every farmer in America will send representatives to the Capitol to protest and no one will dare comply with such an agreement.

Now, I know that there are unreasonable trade restrictions which ought to be done away with, but that is not what these men are talking about in this agreement. They are talking about what I have described as a major operation on those tariff arrangements which have for years protected the American standard of living from the competition of countries which pay from 15 cents to \$1 a day to their labor. I do not wish to discuss the entire tariff issue. I merely say that when you promise the people of England that you will undertake to throw down to any considerable degree these barriers, you are making a promise which you cannot fulfill—which they know you cannot fulfill.

The difficulty about this agreement is that this is a promise which is made to be carried out after England has gotten our \$3,750,000,000. In other words, the first step in this agreement is to be performed by us, namely, to hand over the cash. Then comes the period of repayment by Britain; but that will be conditioned, at least so Britain can say, upon our performing the next step in the agreement, namely, meeting her in an

arrangement for the elimination and relaxation of tariff barriers, and if we do not perform that condition, Senators will hear from their English friends when the next installment on the loan is due—and I can already hear in the not distant future the iteration and reiteration of that affectionate term "Uncle Shylock."

Now, what about England's share in this arrangement? The English have a system of empire preferences which is a system of tariffs designed to maintain preferential trade within the British Commonwealth. We have been told in numerous English statements preceding this agreement that the English did not look with favor upon any such condition for this loan. As a matter of fact, England has been moving in the direction of stringent trade barriers far more than we have in the last 20 years.

But England has an additional reason for looking with disadvantage upon this condition. Certainly, every Member of the Senate must be aware of the kind of government which has now taken over the management of affairs in England. It is a socialist government. It has already taken over the Bank of England and the coal mines and is now proceeding with legislation to take over the transportation and power and communication systems; but at the same time it is committed to putting into effect the Beveridge plan. Not only are the socialists for this, but a considerable number of the Conservatives are for it. Now the Beveridge plan is a proposal something like what we have heard advertised in this country for security from the cradle to the grave. But the Beveridge plan faces this proposal frankly, and we do not. It recognizes that to do this it must establish the most extensive regimentation, not only of private manufacturing and distributing agencies of all kinds, but of the labor unions as well. It is a proposal for planned economy upon the most elaborate scale. When one undertakes to plan the economy of a country he must recognize—and the British do recognize—that planning cannot stop at the waterfront. Trade which flows into Britain from without, as well as trade which flows out of Great Britain, has got to come under the supervision of the planners, as well as trade within the Kingdom—and planned foreign trade is not free trade. One of the first responsibilities of the planner is to set up controls to protect the producers within the planned society from the competition of producers outside. The idea of throwing down trade barriers in a Kingdom which is now going in for a planned economy is a contradiction in terms—and the British will not carry out this agreement any more than we will. But the difference lies in this—that they will already have some more of our cash, and they will find it very easy to put upon us the first violation in the field of dismantling trade barriers.

I said there was a second reason which would make this agreement impossible, and that is that we, at the very outset, cannot carry out our proposal to give them this money without putting upon our own economic system a strain of the first magnitude.

We are called upon, as soon as the agreement is ratified and as fast as England wants the money, to hand over \$3,750,000,000 in American cash. I ask Members of the Senate if they have given any thought to where this money is to come from. Mind you, this is to be a loan by our Government to the British Government. Obviously, our Government does not have the money to make the loan. It must, therefore, go out into the markets of money and borrow it from our people, just as it borrowed the money in the various war loans and in the recent Victory loan.

I wonder if Senators have been induced to suppose that because during this war we could borrow almost unlimited sums we can continue to do it from now on. How are we going to borrow this \$3,750,000,000 from the American people? Are we going to launch a big Britain loan drive? Are we going to bring the stars from Hollywood and Broadway out on the streets singing "Hail, Britannia" and "God Save the King"? And then when the surrounding audience is under the opiate of these enchanting melodies, are we going to get them to fork up their dollars out of their pay envelopes—"dollars for Britain"? Are we going to get our advertisers to take out for the Government full-page advertisements in the newspapers calling upon the workers to buy bonds for Britain? Are we going to see microphone-equipped trucks parked in our city streets calling upon the population to buy bonds for Britain? Does anyone think they are going to buy them? If so, let me call attention to some figures which ought to give us pause even aside from this present issue.

Before the war and throughout the war, we paid the bills of this Government with money from two sources—from taxes and from Government borrowings. Always we have managed to get enough by taxes and by borrowing to more than cover our expenditures and to pile up a very large Government cash reserve in the banks. But things have changed. The war is over. The soldiers are coming home. The workers are striking. The war plants are being emptied, and the people are cashing in their bonds. They are cashing savings bonds at the rate of nearly \$5,000,000 a month. Businessmen who bought Treasury savings notes are cashing them in enormous quantities. An enormous volume of short-term Treasury notes and bills is coming due in the next 2 years, much of which will have to be refunded. It is conceivable that this Government can go out for itself and its own necessities, if they are sufficiently justifiable, and raise additional funds by a series of bonds; but this Government cannot go out and raise money by a series of bond issues for the purpose of handing the money over to Britain, or Russia, or any other country in the world.

Let me call attention to a fact which we would do well to investigate. Since the first of July, the beginning of this fiscal year, in nearly 6 months we have spent, as of December 6, \$17,219,000,000 more than we collected in taxes. Presumably we should have borrowed enough to carry that deficit. We borrowed much, but while we were borrowing, older bond issues and notes were

coming due, so actually we got a net return from our borrowing of only \$13,-500,000,000. In other words, both taxes and borrowings in the first 6 months of this fiscal year up to December 3 have failed to cover our expenditures by \$4,-000,000,000. This deficit has been met out of the cash reserves built up in past borrowings. We may, of course, make up this deficit in the taxes which will be collected this very week, but it will be hard scratching. This is an alarming situation, and I ask Senators to consider what it will be next year, for while the Government expenditures ought to decrease greatly, taxes also will decrease enormously, and the borrowing surplus may well disappear.

Where, then, are we going to get the \$3,750,000,000? I predict that we cannot get it from the people and will be forced to go to the banks for it.

At the beginning of the Victory loan drive just ended Secretary Vinson wisely called on the American people to buy these bonds out of their incomes, warning them that the time had passed when we could afford to indulge in any further inflationary borrowings at the banks. The time has certainly passed, but, above all things, we ought not to permit this Government to indulge in inflationary bank borrowing to lend money to Britain or anybody else, including the United States of America.

Here is a loan of \$3,750,000,000 at 2 percent interest. But because there is a 5-year prologue without interest the actual rate over the whole period will be 1.62 percent a year. Our Government will have to borrow this money from the American people. It will have to pay at least 2½ percent for it. That is the interest rate on the present Victory Loan. It will borrow at 2½ percent and lend to the British at 1.62 percent. We will pay \$93,750,000 a year interest and they, when they pay, will pay us \$60,750,000 a year for the privilege of using the money. The Government will take a loss of \$33,-000,000 a year on the interest account. Of course, this will decrease gradually as the loan is paid off. But I predict it will never be reduced very much, if at all.

This is not all. We are told blithely that this agreement settles the lend-lease problem. But does it? It settles it for the British. But remember, our Government borrowed \$25,000,000,000 to advance to England on lend-lease. Our Government pays at least 2 percent interest on the loan. England gets out of that, but this Government must go on taxing our people \$500,000,000 a year to pay interest on the debt which we forgive.

Let me say, therefore, that we cannot make this loan without adding another severe burden to the fiscal problem of our Government, while on the side of Great Britain, I predict that she will never pay this loan any more than she has paid any other to us. Have we not had enough experience in this field? When we were lending her billions during the last world war, we were the very best fellows in the world. When the war ended, England owed us \$4,000,000,000. She paid a miserable fraction of this, and then began to denounce us as old

Uncle Shylock for even suggesting that she should pay on a very much reduced basis. Does anyone think that either we or our English friends have changed very much?

Then came this war, and the lend-lease proposal. No man in America dreamed that the sums poured out on lend-lease would ever reach such fantastic proportions. Nevertheless, we were told that while we would not ask repayment in dollars, we would get payments for a great deal of it in goods and trade concessions when the war ended. Now, for every dollar of lend-lease to England, and for the billions of installations and surplus property remaining in England, we are getting \$532,000,000, which we are agreeing to spend in England for real estate and construction and educational programs.

We now have a proposal for another loan of \$3,750,000,000. The English themselves have warned us that they take it only because they are desperate. They have practically told us that they could not stand a loan. They have—in words as plain as involved diplomatic double-talk can make it—told us they cannot pay such a loan. After the last war England was in a far more powerful economic condition than she is in today. Yet she could not pay us \$4,000,000,000. Do Senators think that England, weakened as she is today, is better able to assume such an obligation than she was 25 years ago? She will never pay it. Under this arrangement, she is supposed to pay an average of \$96,000,000 a year. Where is she going to get the \$96,000,000? Her exports cannot provide it. They will be scarcely sufficient to pay for her imports from this country. And when England comes to us later and tells us she cannot pay, many persons in America will say that once again England is rooking us—but remember we are going into this with our eyes wide open. England cannot pay this money, and we are sowing the seeds of endless international friction, reviving old animosities, and setting in motion a flood and counter-flood of bitter criticisms across the Atlantic Ocean between two nations which should be friends.

Just one more thought. For what purpose is Britain going to use this money? Some of it she is expected to spend here, and that is supposed to keep our factories going. The rest of it she will spend at home and in various parts of the world; but however she spends it, I remind the Senate that we are lending this, not to British industry but to the British Government.

Mr. President, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that in this world today there is a life-and-death struggle between two systems of government. One of them is our own—the capitalist economic system of private ownership operating under a free republican form of government. The other is a system of economic collectivism operating under a powerful and unlimited central government—either a dictatorship or moving toward dictatorship. The people of England have made their choice. They have decided that they are through with the old capitalism under which England grew powerful and great. I do not make

any defense for those leaders of capitalism in either England or the United States who have committed so many offenses against their own system and who have blindly refused to see its abuses and to correct them. Here in this country, however, I think our choice is clearly indicated. It is to correct the mistakes and eradicate the abuses. In England the choice has been to get rid of the capitalist system and turn to an all-powerful political state which will control the economic life of the nation upon the most comprehensive scale.

I do not question the right of the English people to make this choice. It is their country to do with as they choose; but we cannot escape the fact that in the coming generation one of these systems of life and policy is going to succeed and the other will probably fail. Our just duty is to make our system strong and to use our energies, our wealth, and our devotion to preserve and perpetuate our great society of the free man. I think the English people have a right to take the same course with reference to their new venture in socialism, communism, or whatever one may wish to call it; but I do not think they have a right to ask us to pour out our resources to their Government in order to make its socialistic experiment a success. If they can make it a success, if they can produce that abundance and security of which men have always dreamed, we wish them well. The example of the English and the Russian experiments may lead the world in the same direction in the future. But, on the other hand, for our system of society there is only one hope, and that is that we shall make it a success—that it will succeed upon its own strength—and that we shall let Russia and England and every other socialistic experiment either succeed or fail upon its own merits. If our system succeeds and that of England and Russia fails, the world will come back to our way of life and to our ideals of government.

Certainly we have voted to cooperate with them. We have already provided for international financial cooperation through the Bretton Woods agreement, the Export-Import Bank, and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Through the RFC we have already given them loans on a business basis.

I do not propose that we shall do anything to injure England along the course she has chosen. I believe that we should trade with her, visit with her, and behave generally as reasonable neighbors. If there are any private industries in England which are solvent and can qualify for loans upon the same basis as private industries in America, I would not oppose such loans; but I will oppose loans to the Government of England to make that Socialist government a success, particularly when I know that that government cannot repay the loans and that we cannot afford to make them, and that if we make them we shall be giving a transfusion of blood into this Socialist body out of our own private enterprise body at a moment when we would do well to look to the health of our own country.

Mr. President, I have voted for cooperation with the other countries of the world. I voted to grant great powers to our Executive in those dealings, but I want our representatives truly to represent the interests of America and, above all, I want them to be honest with the American people.

**FURTHER PARTICIPATION IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION**

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4649) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now vote on the bill, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas should make a full statement in regard to the bill and in regard to what the \$1,350,000,000 will be used for and what countries will receive it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senator said that he looked serious, but then he smiled, as if to throw a doubt on his earnestness in the matter.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held public hearings on the bill for two entire days. I did not see the Senator from Ohio there, although he diligently appeared before the committee every day, so far as I now recall, when the committee considered the Palestine resolution. I regret that the Senator from Ohio could not spare any time from his attentions to the Palestine resolution, to favor the committee with his presence when it was considering the UNRRA bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will remember that I appeared before the committee only at the invitation of the committee, and I was not invited to attend the committee's hearings on the UNRRA bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. We were glad to have the Senator there; but I do not recall that we felt that we had to invite the Senator to attend the hearings on a bill to which the public was invited. We did invite the Senator to attend the hearings on the Palestine resolution, because that meeting was secret; and the Senator accepted with alacrity and was there. But he did not do us that honor when we were considering the UNRRA bill; he did not attend the hearings on that bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the hearings were open to the public?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that they were.

Mr. TAFT. No; my understanding is that they were executive hearings. I was not invited to be present.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator could have asked to be present, and we would have been glad to have him there and to hear him.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the UNRRA bill, but I think the facts regarding it should be known to the Senate before it votes for the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator expects to vote for the bill without knowing the facts, I do not see why I should take time to explain the facts. If he is going to vote for the bill without knowing anything about it, why should I spend any time in attempting to enlighten him regarding it?

Mr. President, I may say that House bill 4649 provides for an additional \$1,350,000,000 for the work of UNRRA. The bill amends the original joint resolution by striking out the figure "\$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,700,000,000," making both allocations in the amount of \$1,350,000,000.

As all Senators who have taken any interest in this matter know, this money is expended through the United Nations Organization. Former Governor Lehman, of New York, is president of the Organization—not the American president, but president, or Director, of the entire program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the United Nations Organization, the participating nations subscribe proportionate amounts of money. I believe the United States subscribes approximately 70 percent of the total; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When we make this appropriation, do we know that the other nations are going to subscribe their proportionate amounts, so as to meet their obligations under the UNRRA set-up?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the principal other nations already either have made their appropriations or are in process of making them—Great Britain and the other principal nations. Of course, there are a number of small countries whose allocations are small, and all of them have not as yet made their appropriations. But I understand that Brazil, which contributes quite a substantial sum of money, is taking measures to appropriate its share of the money.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Are they making appropriations to meet the new appropriation which we are making?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is what I am talking about.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So when this appropriation is made by this country, the other nations will have made their corresponding appropriations, on the basis of their original allocations; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. In the main, they have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the Senator says "In the main," does he mean the larger countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I mean the larger countries. I am sending for the hearings now, so that I may give Senators the detailed figures, if they wish to have them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Have the Senate hearings been printed?

Mr. CONNALLY. They have, and I now present the Senator with a copy of them.

Mr. TAFT. I have had a copy of the House hearings, but I have not seen a copy of the Senate hearings.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg pardon; let me say that I have sent for the stenographic copies, and I shall be glad to present one to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Then the Senator from Texas again is mistaken; for he said the hearings were printed, and now I understand the Senator to say that they have not been printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; they have not been. When I saw the volume, I withdrew the statement that they had been printed. I do not expect to attempt to catch the Senator from Ohio on such a trivial matter, nor do I expect him to raise a question as to one so lacking in importance.

Mr. President, there is no attempt to conceal. The UNRRA is a new organization which is confronted with the greatest difficulties in respect to hunger, suffering, and sacrifices in the war-torn countries. The Foreign Relations Committee went over the matter very thoroughly with Governor Lehman. He admitted that there were shortcomings, but he said they were striving to correct them. I do not doubt that there has been waste in many places, but I do not know how we are going to avoid such things in connection with a program of this kind. The UNRRA is a charitable organization. There is no doubt that there are impositions upon it. It has an employee list of 8,000 persons, who are scattered all over the world. It is now extending its activities to some countries which heretofore have not enjoyed the benefits conferred under the UNRRA program. It will begin a program in Italy, where it will spend approximately \$300,000,000. Later on it will begin a program in China, where it will spend approximately \$400,000,000. Those are simply samples of what I am undertaking to point out in answer to the Senator from Ohio.

Although the committee did not approve of a good many things which had been done and a good many things which had not been done by the UNRRA nevertheless, it was of the opinion that we were embarked upon the program and we could not withdraw from it—with the exception that the bill provides, and Governor Lehman and others agree that the program shall end in 1946, so far as Europe is concerned, and on March 31, 1947, insofar as Asia is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. Are the other countries agreed as to the time limit; in other words, that the program shall close on the dates which we are fixing in this authorization bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot assure the Senator categorically of that, but my understanding is that they are agreed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the time now proposed a longer time than was originally intended?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that any time limit was set originally; but most of us thought, when we voted for the first appropriation, that it would be all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the question because, as I remember, in a conversation with Governor Lehman more than a year ago, he said he felt that the major work of UNRRA would be completed with a year after the war. However, this authorization provides for a period beyond that time.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is quite true, I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts; and when the first authorization was passed I chided Governor Lehman on the statement which he was making to the Senator from Massachusetts. I said, "You say this is all you are going to need, but you will be back here next year with a request for another authorization." And faithful to that suggestion, he is back.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it be wise for us not to go so far as is proposed—into 1947—but to have the subject come up again next autumn, when we could look into the matter again?

Mr. CONNALLY. Next autumn would be very near the end of the program, very near the end of 1946.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have in mind the 1947 date.

Mr. CONNALLY. That applies only to Asia. UNRRA has not yet commenced operations in Asia, and so it was felt that it would need those 3 months to wind up the program.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask a further question. When we make this authorization, do we become obligated legally or in any other way to make appropriations beyond the \$750,000,000 now already in course of appropriation?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio knows just as much about that as does the Senator from Texas. He knows what an authorization is, and what an appropriation is. He knows whether we are morally obligated. I do not think we are morally obligated, but I suppose the Senator thinks we are.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. When the question of \$550,000,000 arose in connection with the first authorization, it was said, as I remember, that we were morally obligated. Other nations had gone along and put up their whole 1 percent, or at least some of them did, and I supposed we must do the same. I wonder if we are again getting into a situation where we are practically appropriating the money instead of merely authorizing it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows, as a matter of fact, that when an authorization is made the supposition is carried with it that the money later will be appropriated.

Mr. TAFT. No; I was not and am not certain about it.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no obligation binding upon us. No one can compel us to appropriate the money. However, when we are dealing with other international bodies, if some other nation puts up money on the assumption that we will also appropriate, I think that an obligation is involved upon our part.

Mr. TAFT. The original act expressly disavows any obligation upon our part beyond what we appropriate, does it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. If there was such a disavowal, it would not be changed by the terms of this bill because in it that matter is not dealt with.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the testimony showed before the committee as to when the program is to start in China and in the Orient?

Mr. CONNALLY. No definite date has been agreed upon, but the organization has had representatives in China for a year looking into the situation and preparing for initiating its work in that region. I think they will start shortly after they obtain the money.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am supporting the Senator's bill, because I am somewhat familiar with the problems existing in Europe and the need for relief this winter. I believe, however, that if we have undertaken certain obligations through UNRRA, even though there may have been a better way to perform the work which UNRRA will perform, we will have to follow through in the way we have started because it is not practical to set up an American organization to do the work. But I may state frankly that I have some question in my mind as to whether we are acting soundly in following through with the UNRRA program in China and whether it would not be a better policy for us to furnish relief to China through an American relief organization instead of becoming involved in relief associated in any way with international high politics. I think the problems involved have resulted in our not doing so efficient a job as we could have done with an American organization. So far as Europe is concerned we must go ahead in the way we have started because if we did not do so we would have a duplication of effort. But so far as China is concerned I question very much the policy of furnishing relief through UNRRA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator that if the work were not done through UNRRA it would involve establishing another organization. We would then have two organizations, and would be constantly debating as to which one of the organizations should have the larger number of employees and the greater appropriation. I would favor an American relief organization in Europe disassociated from other nations, but in-

asmuch as we have the present organization I do not think it would be consistent to make a change in our policy in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator that so far as Europe is concerned we are tied in with the present organization. We are contributing about 70 percent of the money, although each of the Nations sitting in the organization has an equal vote. Liberia or Guatemala, for example, has put up a few thousand dollars, and is sitting in the organization with a vote equal to that of the United States. As I have said, we are tied in with the present organization, but we are not in that position so far as the Orient is concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator may—I hope he will not—offer an amendment to set up another organization. We are hoping that the appropriation will cover the situation everywhere.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is it possible to put into the RECORD a statement of what countries will receive this money, and in what sums? I think it appeared somewhere in the hearings. At least, I was told so.

Mr. CONNALLY. A tentative statement to that effect was put into the record, but it cannot be definite and final for the reason that the Administrator himself does not know. I can give the Senator a statement with regard to the matter. Let us consider some of the countries to whom relief will be afforded. For example, let us take Yugoslavia. Does the Senator object to the continuance of operations in Yugoslavia?

Mr. TAFT. What I should like to know is how much Yugoslavia is to receive.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will try and furnish the Senator that information. I cannot dig it out at the moment. I do not suppose, however, that the Senator objects to helping Yugoslavia.

Mr. TAFT. Yugoslavia is a country which is entirely under the control of the interests which exclude American newspaper reporters and all American action of any kind. No American can get into Yugoslavia and see what is taking place there. I doubt very seriously, under those circumstances, whether we should extend relief to Yugoslavia.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator offer an amendment to strike out Yugoslavia and we shall be glad to have it considered. I suppose that the test of the Senator from Ohio is not whether a man's body is hungry and is about to starve, but instead, is what church the man belongs to, or what political party he may be a member of. I do not recognize such artificial standards. If a man is suffering from hunger, he should be fed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire about Poland.

Mr. CONNALLY. Poland is being treated in the best possible way. A great deal of money has been spent there.

Mr. LANGER. I was curious also about Austria and Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. Operations will be started in Austria immediately, although

Austria was an enemy country. When operations were started by UNRRA they did not feed anybody in an enemy country. But the council modified the regulations to the extent that UNRRA will begin a program of furnishing relief in Austria.

Mr. LANGER. And, I presume, sooner or later in Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that later, when the Army gets through feeding people in Germany—the Army is feeding people in Germany at the present time—UNRRA will start operations there. However, inasmuch as the Army is now feeding people in Germany we do not wish to have two agencies operating with the same object in view.

Mr. LANGER. So the appropriation for which we are voting includes Poland, Austria, and later it will include Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I should say, Mr. President, that some of the countries are not asking for anything. Norway, who suffered terribly and was conquered, is not asking for relief. Belgium is not asking for relief. Several other countries have not asked for any relief under UNRRA. Their attitude is a shining tribute to their fine outlook on world affairs.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Did I understand the Senator to say that UNRRA is extending relief into Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I said that it probably would do so ultimately.

Mr. TAFT. Is it contemplated in the report on the bill? The report states that a part of the additional 1-percent contribution will be used to continue UNRRA's existing operations in Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, China, and Italy. The suggestion has been made that we extend operations further to include Austria, Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Formosa, and Korea. Can the Senator tell us what is Byelorussia?

Mr. CONNALLY. Byelorussia is White Russia. It borders Poland and the Baltic provinces. I shall be glad to obtain the necessary information for the Senator. Mr. President, I ask that the revolving globe be brought into the Chamber. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Why must we extend relief to White Russia and to the Ukraine? Those countries are a part of the Soviet Union, are they not?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. We interrogated thoroughly the representatives of the UNRRA on that point. Of course, there is no compulsion upon us to carry this work on within those countries. We are not compelled to do so, but UNRRA is doing it on the ground that Byelorussia and the Ukraine were terribly devastated by the war, both by the Russians themselves in their scorched-earth policy as they retired before the invading Germans, and later by the Germans who swept in toward Stalingrad. They destroyed homes, killed women and children, and murdered members of the civilian population. Finally, with great heroism, the Russians rallied and drove the invader from their soil. However, as I have said, the two territories to which the Senator has referred are a

part of Soviet Russia. We interrogated various officials as to why Russia herself, as a nation, could not meet the requirements of those two territories. The answer was that even Russia herself was not in possession of imports of food and certain articles sufficient in quantity to feed the people in those territories, and that she could not obtain the necessary material except through UNRRA. Byelorussia and the Ukraine made their applications. They are members of the United Nations.

That is the best answer I can give to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have only a few things to say about UNRRA.

From the beginning, I opposed the original organization. I think we should have a national relief organization in which we would be free to pick out those seeking relief, in which we gave the relief, in which we got the credit, in which every cent would be spent by Americans in the interest of relief which we wished to give. I think that would be a far more efficient method. I think we could have done more for the same money, probably by 20 or 25 or 30 percent, than UNRRA ever has done or will do. As an administrative organization UNRRA is inefficient, it has five masters instead of one. It cannot do anything to which Russia objects, it cannot do anything to which England objects, it cannot do anything to which we object. It has to satisfy every one of these nations before it can go ahead. So we had the fiasco of proceeding to supply Italy for months on months when UNRRA should have taken over the job. It seems to me that was the only proper way to handle the matter.

If the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, had been on the job 6 months ago he would have seen that we were prepared to set up a national organization when the money originally appropriated ran out, if it did run out. It seems to me that we should now change the organization to a national organization. But I feel helpless. We are up against the proposition either of voting for relief or not voting for relief. I think this is a most inefficient way to handle it. I think it will result in extending relief, because of political reasons, to places which may not need relief.

I feel very strongly that we have not sufficient knowledge of conditions, because we have not been furnished any detailed information. Relief is to be offered on the basis of starving people. We do not even know how much is to go for food and how much for something else, for agricultural implements, or for lumber. I observed a statement in the press the other day to the effect that lumber for 100,000 housing units was going abroad, I do not know where, or even whether it was under UNRRA.

It seems to me we are pursuing the most inefficient and unsatisfactory method of handling this responsibility. When the money runs out, certainly I shall vote against the next UNRRA authorization. I think we should now make it clear to the foreign nations—

and we can do so—that we are putting up only \$750,000,000 out of \$1,350,000,000, and that we may never put up the other \$600,000,000. Let the other nations contribute only a little more than half their total allotment as we are now doing. If they contribute more, they may be deceived about our intentions. We are not obligated to go on with the \$600,000,000 merely because we authorize the appropriation. I think it should be made clear to the nations that we may not appropriate the additional \$600,000,000. We may choose to handle the matter in some other way, or we may regard the job as finished.

Incidentally, of course, we are not covering large sections of Germany, which are going to be in very much worse shape than some of the other countries. Stories from Germany show conditions there to be worse, in many respects, than in other countries, not so bad as in some of the countries, but worse than that in others.

If we create a situation in which millions of people starve in Germany and Japan, certainly we will look back upon our neglect with shame.

Mr. President, in my opinion Congress is not in a position to substitute another form of organization, so, with the greatest regret, I intend to vote for the appropriation. But I think the administration has lamentably failed in presenting an economically reasonable American plan for the distribution of relief.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that I shall vote for the appropriation relying upon the word of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas that Germany, Hungary, Austria, and Poland will get some of the money.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Texas did not say that. He said they probably would. I do not give my guarantee they will ever get a dime.

Mr. LANGER. I give notice that if I find they are not getting it, I shall introduce a bill whereby this Government will see to it that the suffering women and children of those four countries get a sufficient amount of food to enable them to sustain life.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a great many Senators have been concerned about this UNRRA matter for some time. I presume most of the Members of the Senate are greatly in favor of the aid we are giving to displaced and unfortunate people in the occupied territories. But letters such as the one I have in my hand, a portion of which I shall read, are certainly disturbing indeed, and I think show the need for some drastic action, and serious consideration, before we blithely donate billion after billion without being assured that we get at least commensurate results for the sacrifices our action will eventually cost the American people.

I shall read a portion of a letter applicable to UNRRA which I received 3 days ago from an American Army officer in Europe. This man is about 50 years of age. He is a lawyer by profession, a very successful lawyer, a man of substantial judgment, who went into the service as

a patriotic duty, and at considerable sacrifice to himself. He says this, among other things:

This UNRRA is probably the most modern Cook's tour at public expense I have ever seen. They, from the top down, are for the most part a disorganized mob—not "Kitchen's mob" but "Lehman's mob." There are a relatively small percentage of most excellent, hard-working people. There are many with good impulses and a rather philanthropic outlook. But there is a god-awful percentage of them who are merely here for the buggy ride, and they have considerable social life, all they can stand.

The chief trouble, in my judgment, is that it lacks any organization. This job of handling DP's could have been done a thousand percent better by the Army. I used several UNRRA teams and they did all right. UNRRA didn't even know where they were. But we took care of them and had an Army officer over them always. That was better all around. They didn't know anything about supplies and they had no transportation. That had been sold, loaned, or stolen in Paris, I see by today's paper.

It is my opinion that probably \$900 out of every \$1,000 appropriated to UNRRA is absolutely squandered—unnecessarily wasted. That money could well be better given to some of these homeless devils than to provide travel, entertainment, and sustenance for UNRRA personnel.

If we could have another Hoover relief set-up it could do a much better job, and much more easily here as the Army is along to help. They would not be working in hostile territory as in Russia.

But a large part of the remaining DP's are actually not properly so designated. Many came here prior to the war. Many came to Germany to escape the Russians—just as did the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. Now they have no place to go.

Mr. President, that closes the paragraphs with reference to UNRRA; but I will say, in connection with those paragraphs, that the letter gives me a great deal more concern because I know this man. I know his background, I know his general attitude. He is not a Regular Army officer, he does not praise the Army organization there because of any lifetime loyalty to the Regular Army. In my opinion, his judgment is sound, and I am concerned when this man, whom I know, makes a measured and considered statement of this kind about the squandering of the money which the American people are sacrificing from their own reconversion, from their own needs, in a humanitarian effort to aid other people. I am concerned about his statement that about nine-tenths of the money is being squandered, in his judgment, by these officials who are disorganized, and who spend the money for private entertainment and private travel, and do not give it to the people who are hungry and starving, and who will die this winter if they are not afforded assistance.

Mr. President, I am for this UNRRA appropriation and for all the relief we can properly give these people, but I think there is a tremendous responsibility which, if not met, will amount to neglect on the part of those in charge, if we do not see that as nearly as possible a hundred cents from every dollar we give goes to the humanitarian purposes for which the people of this country are sacrificing, and for which they are willing to sacrifice in the future.

Mr. President, I think the confusion of UNRRA will some day be clearly shown to be a national and an Allied disgrace if it is not corrected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything in the debate, because I am almost as critical of some phases of UNRRA as are some of the Senators who have preceded me. But let us not overlook the fact that there is a personnel in UNRRA which is highly dedicated to the faithful discharge of a high, humanitarian obligation.

I am particularly moved to testify because of the letter just read by the able Senator from Iowa, in which his correspondent expresses the fear that UNRRA funds are being dissipated in personnel expense and personnel travel and entertainment. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that the administrative expense of UNRRA is taken care of in a fund separate from the UNRRA fund itself. As compared with \$1,350,000,000, which was our contribution to the first year's operation, the administrative expense was \$24,812,189. In other words, even compared to our contribution alone, the administrative expense in UNRRA was less than 2 percent of our contribution, and that less than 2 percent figure I give the Senate is the total administrative obligation. So I say to the able Senator from Iowa that, so far as the particular charge which was brought to his attention is concerned, I very much doubt whether it is justified, except in the isolated instances which will be found in every institution of this magnitude. The administrative expense, I repeat, is less than \$25,000,000 out of a fund which is approximately one and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that this is not the only such letter which has come to me. I have received a number of letters from different places in Europe where the UNRRA funds are being expended and activities are going on which contain somewhat similar statements of suspicion, of doubt, and of criticism. I have not undertaken to introduce them into the RECORD because I do not care to continue or to prolong a controversy on manifestly a humanitarian and a needed activity. I read this letter today because, first, of the supreme confidence I have in the man who wrote it, and, secondly, in the hope that in some small way the message of this man, who has been on the job for many months, in fact he has been over there for a year and a half in this particular activity, may bring us to our senses, so that we will establish some kind of reorganization which will bring the highest degree of efficiency into UNRRA. I believe UNRRA is not at the highest peak of efficiency so far as getting the foods which are purchasable by dollars and available by dollars, quickly and directly to the people who need it and should have it. I certainly should not want to continue or prolong this argument by placing in the RECORD a great number of

letters dealing with the question of inefficiency, but I hope the letter I read will in some small measure help to straighten out the situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I hope the Senator does not for an instant believe that I am questioning the necessity which he emphasizes for maximum efficiency in making appropriations for UNRRA reach the maximum of humanitarian service. I quite agree with him that the more general the discussion of the problem can be the greater is the probability of the highest proportion of efficient and effective result. I simply felt that we could hardly be justified as a Senate in voting any additional UNRRA appropriation if I allowed the record to stand with the unchallenged suggestion that practically 90 percent of the appropriation is lost or misdirected or maladministered. I do not believe that to be so, and I have given the specific figures to demonstrate that it cannot be so in respect to administrative expense.

That certainly does not mean for an instant that there has not been maladministration, that there has not been waste, that there have not been instances, many of them, of far too much seepage between the donor and the donee. I doubt—and I am sure the Senator will agree with this statement—whether it would have been humanly possible to put together a human institution such as UNRRA in the midst of Europe's disorganization and disintegration, suddenly to serve with adequate sufficiency the needs of those war-torn areas where often there has been no semblance of legal Government remaining. Yet I agree with the Senator that every possible effort toward improvement must be made, so long as we are continuing this particular method of serving these relief necessities. I agree that there cannot be too much emphasis placed upon the necessity for improved administration and added assurance that relief will reach those for whom it is intended. Even though that be brought to a maximum peak, I will say to the Senator, I am convinced that this should be our last year of UNRRA, because I am convinced that beyond this particular period, if there is any necessity for additional services of this nature, it will be far better for us if we selectively handle the relief ourselves, under our own administration, and on whatever basis our judgment may recommend.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to hear the Senator make the last statement, especially because I feel that so much of the confusion and inefficiency and loss under UNRRA is directly traceable to the original conception of UNRRA and its original set-up—its original responsibility. It is entirely probable that it is too late now to change the set-up in the middle of this operation, and I would not advocate it at this time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me inject myself again at that point. This is the situation, I think, in which the Senate finds itself—and I think that was the feeling in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: We are caught on the horns

of a dilemma. Obviously, except as it has organized relief, particularly in central Europe, during this approaching winter and the following spring, the inevitable results will be that misery will be followed by chaos and chaos will be followed by anarchy or worse. It is impossible to substitute any other sort of service for this winter and early spring. We have not the time; we have not the facilities; we have not the organization. It is this or nothing, and it is essentially in that spirit in which I have been satisfied to close my eyes to some of the things I dislike—and I dislike them just as much as does any other Senator upon this floor—and to agree that for 1 year there is no alternative to proceeding under the existing formula.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With reference to the Senator's statement that this could not be done by a new organization quickly enough, I will say that I was the secretary of the American Relief Administration after the last war—

Mr. VANDENBERG. Wait a moment. I think the Senator is misquoting me. I said it could not be done with complete efficiency in the midst of the sudden situation which we confront.

Mr. TAFT. So far as Congress is concerned, I agree with the Senator that we have no choice because we cannot originate a new kind of an organization.

I sailed with Mr. Herbert Hoover from Boston the day after the armistice, on November 12. By the 1st of February we had operating relief organizations in Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, later on in Armenia, in Poland, and later on also in Lithuania. We built up the personnel of that organization in 3 months. It was not on such an elaborate scale as the present organization. Its overhead was one-tenth of what UNRRA's overhead is, but I think we did as effective a relief job in that winter after the First World War, which was very similar to this war, as could have been done. And I feel very confident that if the administration, foreseeing the need of this \$1,350,000,000 3 months ago, had said "We will administer our own organization" it could have built up an American organization to administer relief. Now it may be too late. As I have said, I do not see much choice except to vote for the bill, because we in Congress cannot originate another kind of organization, but I think the administration could have done it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I emphatically agree that the type of service rendered in this field following World War I is a model which we might well have hoped to emulate, and I wish it had been done.

I desire to add a word in respect to the situation in which Congress finds itself when it has to audit accounts of this nature. I want to lay bare the utter impotence of any committee in Congress to deal adequately with the Senate's responsibility when an appropriation of this sort has to be authorized. It is absolutely impossible under the existing organization of the Senate system for

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee confidently to pass upon whether the past expenditure has been properly or wisely made, or whether the new appropriation is justified. Until Congress arms itself with its own adequate and independent corps of investigators and auditors in respect to these expenditures we shall continue to be 95 percent at the mercy of the executive branch of the Government. What can the Senate Foreign Relations do when a problem of this sort is suddenly dumped upon the table? What can it do to explore the realities? All in the world it can do is to go on a fishing expedition here and there, by way of cross-examination, hoping to disclose some useful information.

When an appropriation of this size is made for a specific purpose, the Congress ought to have its own agents to follow the appropriation every hour of every day from the beginning of the year to the end. I know of no greater service that is waiting to be rendered, not only to the Senate but to the American people and the solvency of our public credit, than the report which I hope is coming from the joint congressional committee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in the very near future, which will make it possible for the first time for a committee of Congress adequately to confront the executive departments of the Government when the executive departments are either, on the one hand, attempting to justify what they have done or, on the other hand, attempting to justify that which they seek in the future.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In that connection, I invite the attention of the Senate to a bill which I introduced, Senate bill 958, which has been reported. It is a bill to provide for a more effective inspection and supervision of the Congress with respect to the administration of the laws of the United States. It would establish a joint committee for that purpose and authorize it to be adequately staffed to inquire into such things from time to time, and continuously, so that the Congress might be informed as to how our laws are being administered and how funds are being expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator, and I congratulate him upon the proposal which he has submitted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall yield in a moment. I merely wish to add in passing that I doubt if it will be sufficient to have a general staff for the purpose of general inquiry. In an undertaking of this magnitude, for example, I doubt whether we can ever adequately audit the ultimate report, either in terms of dollars and cents or in terms of service rendered, except as our specific agents, representing us alone and responsible exclusively to us, are following the appropriation from the hour it is made down to the hour when it is exhausted.

I apologize to the Senator from Nebraska for keeping him waiting. I now yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. Before doing so I wish to make the observation that I was one of those who originally opposed the UNRRA set-up. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his remarks, because they are an absolute defense to the vote which I cast against UNRRA when the legislation was first passed. I only hope that the time will come when we may have our own independent organization, acting as such to expend funds for relief.

Getting down to the pending bill, whether we had our wishes with respect to the original organization or not, I believe that the only road we can now follow is the one described by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator recently to make a statement on the floor of the Senate that before any more appropriations to UNRRA were made he felt that we should get behind the "iron curtain" and find out what was behind some of the foreign policy, and what was done with the food and other relief supplies, before we granted an appropriation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. WHERRY. What did the Senator say?

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the contrary. So far as the impression which I evidently left with the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, my speech was a total failure. The plea which I was making at that moment was that it was not fair to withhold a crust of bread from a dying man to see whether a reporter was available to take a picture of it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the definition of that particular phase of his remarks, because I did not correctly understand him. I gained the impression from the distinguished Senator that the appropriation proposed at that time, which was approximately \$550,000,000, should be granted for the very reason he now states; but I certainly gained the impression from him that the Foreign Relations Committee, and especially the distinguished Senator from Michigan, would insist that in connection with future appropriations we should get behind the "iron curtain" and gain the full knowledge that starving people actually got relief.

We now have before us a proposal for an appropriation of \$1,350,000,000. I certainly gained from the distinguished Senator from Michigan the impression that we should insist upon inquiring into the needs of the petitioning countries, and that we should have something to say, through amendments to the legislation, as to whether we should get behind the iron curtain and make sure that materials we sent over there reached the people in the countries who actually needed them. Am I correct in that impression?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think my previous answer to the Senator evidently was not complete. I thought the Senator was inquiring only with respect to the

first appropriation, to which my previous address related.

Certainly the net result of the "iron curtain" speech, if there was any net result identifying it, was the conviction that the iron curtain must be lifted in Europe before there can be the remotest hope of permanent international co-operation or the remotest possibility of international peace.

Mr. WHERRY. It was one of the finest speeches I have ever heard the Senator deliver in the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator. Furthermore, I am sure that the Senator is justified in saying that even though I felt that it was improper to attach a requirement to insist upon a free press before proceeding with our humanities, I urged that there should be every possible inquiry into the situation, so that we could have maximum information in respect to the administration and the integrity of the disposition of relief supplies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his observations, because he has stated exactly the way I felt. That was my reaction at the time the Senator made the statement.

If the Senator will further yield, I wish to say that at the time the \$550,000,000 appropriation was before us, if I correctly remember, all the amendments to the bill requiring observers and newspaper correspondents to be permitted to go into the petitioning countries were stricken by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That was in connection with the \$550,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe so.

Mr. WHERRY. The theory was that we had already made the commitment, and that therefore no strings should be attached, but that we should appropriate the \$550,000,000 because of the emergency. I took the position of the distinguished Senator from Michigan in that appropriation.

The bill under consideration, which is House bill 4649, contains certain restrictions and limitations, as I read the bill. One of them is in subparagraph (2) on page 2. The language of the paragraph is as follows:

(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Did that language meet with the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Completely.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the kind of an investigation which we really should have can be made if the petitioning countries furnish the personnel and facilities? I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that I had submitted an amendment which was almost identical with the provisions

of subparagraph (2), with the exception of the last three lines. I should like to read the amendment, because I submitted it as an amendment to the \$550,000,000 appropriation, for the very reason which the Senator from Michigan stated. However, he said that we had already made our commitments, and should not vote restrictions on a commitment already made. We are now making a new appropriation. The amendment which I intended to offer to the Senate was offered in the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe it was defeated by only 1 or 2 votes of the members present on that occasion. The amendment provided that—

such countries shall supply to accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, and in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country for the purpose of obtaining information as to the need for and the use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished such country.

I understand that the language appearing in subparagraph 2, page 2, came over from the House; but I point out to the distinguished Senator that my amendment would provide that UNRRA personnel, other than the nationals of that particular country, would be required to do the very thing provided for in subparagraph (2) in the bill. Under the provisions of subparagraph (2) as it stands, the personnel could and I think would be taken from White Russia or the Ukraine, and we would have to be satisfied with their observations and investigations. Under those circumstances, I ask the Senator whether we would ever get behind the iron curtain, so as to find out whether the food, implements, and supplies were actually going to the place where they should go?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so under those circumstances.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator if the Foreign Relations Committee or he would be favorable to my amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I believe that the bill should be passed as it comes to us from the House, because the limitations have been very carefully weighed and agreed upon. I am unable to conceive that subparagraph (2), beginning in line 13 on page 2 of the bill, could be administered in good faith unless external personnel dealt with the inspection and investigation in any particular foreign country.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will further yield, before the Senate Small Business Committee we had considerable testimony on this question. One of the reasons why I offered the amendment was the fact that one of the administrators of UNRRA stated that in order to get food into White Russia and the Ukraine it would probably be necessary to use UNRRA personnel appointed by the Russian Government, and that UNRRA would have to rely upon their investigations and observations as to

whether the food should be sent in, and whether it would reach the starving people about whom we have been talking.

Under subparagraph (2) we have no assurance as to what will become of the food once it reaches the Ukraine or White Russia. This amendment has nothing to do with the so-called freedom of the press amendment. I am stating that UNRRA personnel other than nationals from the petitioning countries ought to be the ones to go in and check up on the claims of the recipient on petitioning countries, and UNRRA personnel should trace the shipments to the very people who obtain relief.

They ought to check upon the food from the very hour we provide it until it reaches the mouths of the people who are starving. We have no assurance under the terms of this bill that that will be done. We must take the word of personnel of the petitioning countries. If I correctly understood the Senator's interpretation of what he stated about the so-called iron curtain, we would not get behind the iron curtain in the Ukraine and in White Russia so as to make sure that the starving people received the food. At least the personnel should be appointed outside the Ukraine or White Russia, whose representatives would give their own views and figures as to their needs. We have been talking about feeding starving people. What assurance is given the Senate that the food will ever reach the starving people of the Ukraine or of White Russia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator is asking the Senator from Michigan, I will give the Senator from Nebraska no guaranties about anything that may happen at any time, anywhere, in connection with any possible subject, in Byelorussia or the Ukraine until the iron curtain is rolled up.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, for whom I have the most profound respect, in the statement he has just made.

So again I ask, what is the objection to the amendment I have offered, which provides that UNRRA personnel other than nationals from participating countries shall make the inspections and observations? My amendment does not provide that persons outside the UNRRA organization make the inspections. It merely provides that personnel of UNRRA, made up of personnel other than the nationals of the petitioning country, shall inspect and investigate, so that we may actually know the needs of such country and so that we may actually be sure that the food and implements and supplies go where they are needed.

I wish to point out further to the distinguished Senator that in the testimony before the committee it was stated that only 50 percent of the funds went for food and the other 50 percent went for implements. Some of the UNRRA shipments sent over last year included 35,000 tractors and 500 or 600 combines. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator what assurances we shall have, unless we have the check provided for in

the amendment that inspection shall be made by UNRRA personnel from outside the petitioning country, that additional shipments of tractors will reach the people in White Russia or in the Ukraine who need them. Unless the amendment is adopted what assurance will we have that tractors will not be sent to some other place, to satisfy the desire or demand of the Russian Government? What assurance will we have that any supplies sent to countries dominated by Russia will reach starving and needy people?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not care to take any responsibility for identifying who shall receive the tractor or who shall receive the combine. UNRRA deals with the governments of the various countries. It has to hold the governments responsible for the net results.

In connection with the adding of two Russian Soviets to this year's list of recipients of UNRRA relief, the testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee at least pretends to show that a very careful inquiry was made to establish the necessity. Under the terms of the bill and under the assurances given us in the testimony, the relief sent into those countries, as in the case of that sent into other countries, must be followed by adequate and satisfactory investigation and inspection. So far as I am concerned, I think the bill as drawn clearly indicates without necessity for any further bill of particulars, the need for independent inspection and investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his answer. If he feels that this paragraph amply provides for inspections, and that we shall be able to place the food in the hands of the dying people over there, then we have accomplished something. I cannot agree with him; we do not get behind the "iron curtain." I wish to say further that the testimony offered at the hearings just mentioned showed that the two countries I have been discussing had not permitted the personnel of UNRRA from other nations even to suggest an investigation or a check-up regarding their needs. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are defeating the very purposes for which we are making the appropriations when we do not insist that adequate investigations and inspections be made. We are the grantors; we are providing almost 75 percent of the funds to be used for these purposes. Why cannot we provide that a petitioning country shall permit an investigator or observer to enter it and check on these things, so as to make sure that the starving people—the ones who really need the assistance—receive it. Why cannot we include such a provision or requirement in the bill? What is the haste? What is the need for hurry?

We already have granted \$550,000,000, and we already have appropriated another \$750,000,000. If we are to guard the taxpayers' money, I think the Senate of the United States has a perfect right to insist that a petitioning country which is pleading that its people are starving shall permit the personnel of UNRRA from countries other than the petitioning country to enter that country, make a

check, and see what is needed, and I think UNRRA has a perfect right to follow through, so as to see that the people who are starving and the people who wish to farm the land, the people who are ready and able to produce the agricultural crops, are the ones who receive the implements.

I think the amendment I have suggested can do a great measure of good. I only hope that subparagraph 2, as interpreted by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, will bring it to pass.

I certainly feel that when we appropriate \$1,350,000,000 for starving people and people who expect to till the land, so as to become self-sustaining, we have a right to see to it that the food and implements go where they should go; and it seems to me that any country participating in the UNRRA agreement would be glad to see that such investigations are made.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say first that I agree with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I think there is no doubt that some of the UNRRA material which was sent to Yugoslavia was immediately sent to another country. There is no doubt of that at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly not.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that in my office I have a very fine blanket which was donated by the American Red Cross. A friend of mine went to the basement of Selfridge's store, in London, and found that thousands of them could be purchased there. Right on the blanket is marked "Donated to the starving and freezing people \* \* \* by the American Red Cross."

There is no question that something is wrong. Of course, as the Senator from Texas has said, the organization is new, and it is difficult to get it properly set up. But I agree with the Senator from Nebraska in the statement he has made in connection with offering his amendment, and I join him in offering it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his suggestion.

Mr. President, I wish to state further that in the testimony which was taken before the Small Business Committee it was stated—I do not say the statement is true—that 90 percent of the UNRRA supplies given to a certain country were sold in that country and the money was not paid back to UNRRA, but was placed in the treasury of that country. I am not saying that is authentic, but I will say that other persons testified that in case after case UNRRA supplies were sold and money for them was collected, and the country that received the supplies received the benefit of the money.

Senators assure us that they wish to feed starving people. I, too, wish to feed starving people. I wish to have that done just as much as does the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, and I do not wish to put any impediment in the UNRRA bill which is designed to have that result, even though I was against it in the first instance. But certainly,

Mr. President, inasmuch as we contribute nearly 75 percent of the money, we have a right to say that all the food that is bought with the money contributed by the countries participating under the agreement shall go to the people who need it to sustain their lives, and that the money to be devoted to the purchase of implements shall be used to buy tractors and combines which will be used by the people who need them, rather than to have the money used by some of the governments as they please.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the pending authorization bill. Congress has met every demand for funds made by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, because under the conditions there has been nothing else to do. Congress previously appropriated \$1,350,000,000, covered by the first authorization. On Saturday, the Senate appropriated \$750,000,000 in addition to the \$1,350,000,000, even though the authorization for a second \$1,350,000,000 had not been finally enacted.

Mr. President, I feel certain that all Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives are keenly alive to the distress and starvation of the unfortunate people living in the war area in Europe. I certainly am, for I was one of a group of Senators who inspected that area shortly after the conclusion of the European war. However, we all know that an appropriation and expenditure of public funds to relieve the distressed and the starving will not accomplish the purposes desired unless the organization administering the expenditure of such vast sums is efficiently operated and unless the relief reaches those in actual need and dire distress.

The United States pays 72 percent of the total expenditures of this organization. It is my firm conviction that up to this date, UNRRA has been conducted in a most inefficient and wasteful manner. I appreciate that because of the very nature of the work it has undertaken, a certain amount of inefficiency is almost inevitable; but as one who has personally investigated the operations of UNRRA in Europe, and as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which made a further investigation during which Governor Lehman and other officials were examined. I believe that unless UNRRA is reorganized and placed on a more efficient basis, thousands and hundreds of thousands of people will die of starvation in Europe during the coming months, despite the enormous appropriations which the United States has made. I say this reluctantly, but I voice the opinion, I think, of practically every Member of the House of Representatives and Member of the Senate who has visited Europe and has had first-hand contact with the operations of UNRRA.

Mr. President, I publicly appeal to Governor Lehman, the head of the UNRRA, without delay to place the ablest and most patriotic businessmen he can secure at the head of the distribution of food, clothing, fuel, and other necessities for existence, to eliminate the inefficiency and the lack of coordinated leadership

now existing, and to place his organization in the condition which is required if it is to provide efficiently the necessities of life to those who are in such great distress and such imminent danger of death from starvation and freezing.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, this afternoon I have listened to a great deal of criticism of UNRRA. I have a feeling that I am a member of a very inefficient committee, namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The assumption of most Senators who have spoken is that the Foreign Relations Committee has not investigated anything concerning the matter which is now under consideration, and that Governor Lehman has not taken any pains to administer his office in a proper manner.

I am perfectly willing to admit that former President Hoover did a great job in handling relief in Belgium during the First World War.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I forgot to add the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. I merely wanted to say that at that time Mr. Hoover and myself were a part of the Democratic administration in doing the work to which the Senator has referred, so there can be made no claim of political superiority of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. I hope I did not suggest that the work was done in any political way. I was trying to throw out a bouquet to President Hoover. I now include the Senator from Ohio. I think that my offense perhaps was in not saying that it was not only President Hoover but his entire organization that did the great work which it did.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, was that at the time President Hoover was still open to receive the Democratic nomination for President?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know. I believe that at that time he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not true in any sense. He was Food Administrator, and American Relief Administrator, and was not a candidate for any office.

Mr. TUNNELL. I recall that he was a candidate for the Democratic nomination in four States.

Mr. TAFT. He may have been after President Wilson died. I do not know about that, but I am speaking of a time 2 years before President Wilson died, or at least a year before that time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, in order to get on, we will all admit that Mr. Hoover was highly efficient in feeding starving people in Europe.

I wish to proceed directly to the matter which I started to discuss.

It appears that most of the criticism which we have heard has been coming from persons who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee. For that I am very glad. The Foreign Relations Committee has exercised considerable pains in connection with this matter. I believe that the members of that committee have a pretty good idea about how the money has been and will be spent. I do not believe there is a situation such as many friends on the critical side of the subject seem to believe. I have no doubt that many things could be done in

a better way than they have been done by Governor Lehman. Governor Lehman is only a human being. He has under his authority approximately 8,000 employees in UNRRA. If he were to do all the things which have been suggested, in my opinion he would necessarily require 108,000 employees. I believe that the actual distribution of food would require many more employees than he now has.

I do not entirely agree with those who have said they would favor an entirely American organization, notwithstanding the arguments which might be made in that regard. As I recall, about two-thirds of the money, or perhaps 70 percent of the total funds used by UNRRA, comes from the United States. It is my recollection that the subscriptions have amounted to 1 percent of the income of the people of the various countries taking part in UNRRA for the year 1943. We are receiving at least some help from the remainder of the world.

I was very glad when it was shown that the man who had written to the Senator from Iowa thought he was right. That man was offering what he believed to be genuine criticism when he told of the cost of administration. From his statement it might be believed, if one thought that the man knew what he was talking about, that 90 percent of the funds of UNRRA was being wasted. The fact is, as shown by the Senator from Michigan, that only approximately 2 percent of the contribution of the United States is used in the total administration of UNRRA.

Mr. President, I think it is well for Senators to understand this: UNRRA is spending a large amount of money. A large number of people are in need of something with which to save them from starvation.

I remember that when Governor Lehman came before the Committee on Foreign Relations he stated that what was needed was something with which to relieve starvation and prevent pestilence after the Army had moved on. The Army took care of the situation so long as it was in a given territory. But as it moved out there had to be an organization provided to take on the work, and a civilian organization was, as he believed and as we believe, the proper kind of an organization to furnish for the purpose of relieving existing conditions.

It is not entirely the work of the United States that is being done in connection with countries that were liberated by the Allied armies. It is something in which the other members of the Allied Nations had an interest. And they are contributing large amounts of money. I regret that the idea has been expressed that it is a mistake for the United States to use money which is being contributed by our allies for this purpose. I do not believe that the waste which has been mentioned has been to any extent comparable with what has been stated.

As I understood Governor Lehman when he spoke before the Foreign Relations Committee, he said that he was going to have inspections made in all countries which are receiving aid. He said that he would require employees of the UNRRA to be present in order to see that

the funds were expended as they should be. Furthermore, he said that if that were not done the expenditures would be discontinued.

During the course of the testimony and deliberations of the committee, it was finally determined that the head of UNRRA is an American, one who as its governor had had charge of a great State for several terms. He is now devoting his entire time, as I understand, to the work of administering UNRRA. I cannot believe that he is as inefficient as some of our friends seem to believe he is. Certainly, no evidence was presented before the Foreign Relations Committee which would in any way suggest that there has been any great degree of inefficiency in connection with the administration of UNRRA. However, inasmuch as UNRRA's work is being done in a large part of the world which was overrun by armies, where much of the life of the country was destroyed, and where business was wiped out, there is bound to be a lack of efficiency to the extent which one would expect in connection with the operation of some of our large business houses or large institutions, although sometimes we find that even they are not operated efficiently.

But after all is said and done, we come around to the very cause of the appropriation which we are asked to make. We are being appealed to to relieve starving peoples. The appeal comes to a people who are in a less straitened circumstance. The situation appeals to human beings, and it especially appeals to us. I am glad to say that members of the Foreign Relations Committee, so far as I heard them express themselves, agree that there can and will be increased efficiency in connection with the administration of UNRRA, and that the demand for aid at once is terrific. We should give aid which will not begin a year from now or 5 years from now, but will begin at once.

Mr. President, today I heard someone say that perhaps a large number of people in Germany will starve this winter. Many of them are starving today, it is claimed, but the fact is that there is an urgency, and, as Governor Lehman told us, he must know what he can do, he must be able to tell the people who are to get the particular benefits what they can get and when they can get them, if they are to do the most good.

Of course, there is the criticism that this relief is being distributed through other governments. I mentioned the fact that UNRRA believed it to be better to distribute through those who have an intimate knowledge of conditions in the countries in which the distribution is made.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate today that UNRRA sells things. I think it is admitted that material is turned over to the government of a country which may sell to those who can pay in their own countries, and the proceeds are used in a way that is considered satisfactory by UNRRA. So that there is some truth in the contention that there are sales. There are sales which are known to UNRRA. There are such things as farm machinery, and my understanding is that people can get them

if they can pay the government, and the government is using the funds collected in administering relief and help.

I merely wanted to say a word showing that I believe UNRRA is doing a tremendous amount of good, comparable to what would be done by the United States if it had its own organization, and comparable to what any new organization would be likely to do under similar conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if section 2 is a restriction or a recommendation in this appropriation bill, which was not in the first one.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator knows the answer to that as well as does the Senator from Texas. What does he mean by section 2? Is he referring to the language to the provision on page 2, subdivision (2), which reads:

(2) That each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations.

Mr. WHERRY. I say, is not that a restriction in this bill which was not in the first appropriation we made for UNRRA?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that it is a restriction.

Mr. WHERRY. I said a recommendation or a restriction. Let the Senator define it in any way he pleases. Is it a restriction, or limitation, or recommendation?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is merely a condition.

Mr. WHERRY. I accept the definition that it is a condition, and I ask the Senator whether it is not a condition which was not in the first appropriation for UNRRA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know whether it was in the first bill or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator that it was not in the first bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator complain of the provision?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I think it is a fine step in the right direction; and in view of the fact that we made it a condition, I ask the Senator whether he will accept a modification to strike out line 23, and after line 23, and insert the following:

And in making all necessary inspections and investigations, including inspections and investigations by personnel other than nationals of such country, for the purpose of obtaining information and the need for and use of the relief and aid being or to be furnished to such country.

The only difference is that I am asking that the Senator consider an amendment which provides that those who do

the inspecting should be different from the personnel of the countries which petition. It seems to me that would help in the inspections, because the inspections would be made by nationals of other countries, rather than the nationals of the petitioning country.

Mr. CONNALLY. That would greatly complicate matters. It would add to the burdens of UNRRA. This subdivision represents a great advance over what we have now, and I hope the Senator will be satisfied with it. The bill has passed the House of Representatives and is now before the Senate. Any amendment will have to go to conference.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like, if I can, to vote for the appropriation. I am satisfied that when the amendment I offered in the Committee on Appropriations was considered the members felt kindly toward it. It was defeated by a vote of only one. I am quite satisfied it would make a better and more constructive piece of legislation out of the bill. The bill as it is drawn provides that the investigating personnel can be appointed from the recipient country, which amounts practically to no investigation at all. Under my amendment there would be an investigation by personnel of UNRRA other than those from the country petitioning for the relief. That would provide a double check as to where the food goes and where the implements go in giving the countries the relief that is so badly needed.

Mr. CONNALLY. UNRRA is not required to accept the nationals of the recipient countries. UNRRA could conduct its own investigation independently of them. But the requirement is that "each recipient country shall supply accredited United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel with all necessary facilities, credentials, documents, and safe conduct in carrying out the objectives of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration agreement, including all necessary inspections and investigations."

How there could be any objection to that I cannot see. I hope the Senator will not delay us. We are about ready to vote. I hope he will not delay us with an amendment which I think would hamper the activities and facilities by which UNRRA will discharge its duties. The provision in the bill does not prevent UNRRA having its own inspections.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to offer the amendment. I had hoped the Senator would take it as a modification. I do not wish to hold up the vote at all. I am satisfied that if the Senator from Texas would accept the amendment, then the inspections to be made in White Russia and the Ukraine would be made in those areas by nationals of other countries, which would afford a double check on the materials and the food sent in. I think it would be a more workable plan, and I am satisfied that those who contribute would feel much better about where the appropriations for food would go in the petitioning countries. Otherwise we have no check whatever in any country under Russian control.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from Texas for information.

On the first page of the bill, line 7, it is provided as follows:

The first section is amended by striking out "\$1,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,700,000,000."

Are we to understand that on this \$2,700,000,000 the \$1,350,000,000 we have already appropriated is a credit, and we are just making provision for the additional amount?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIS. The date is changed from 1946 to 1947, which carries it to June 30, 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the end of the fiscal year. The Senator is correct. The reason is that UNRRA wanted 3 months to administer the Chinese and Asia relief and liquidate the organization there. The European relief will end December 31, 1946.

Mr. WILLIS. If other funds were needed in 1947 beyond the \$2,700,000,000, there would be a new authorization?

Mr. CONNALLY. UNRRA would have to come back to Congress for a new authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill H. R. 4649 was passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I demanded the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; they were not ordered.

#### RESTORATION OF PALESTINE AS A HOMELAND FOR THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 44.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WAGNER. I understand the junior Senator from Connecticut has an amendment he desires to propose.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which lies on the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, beginning with the word "with", strike out all down to and including line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be opportunity for colonization, so that they may assist to reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall enjoy equal rights."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed deletes a considerable portion of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and makes it somewhat similar to Senate Joint Resolution 112, which was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr.

TAFT]. Before pointing out what seems to me to be the defect in Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 as it now stands, I wish to say that I have not been in communication in any way whatever with any Federal Department or any other organization—official or otherwise—and have discussed the subject in no way, shape, or form with any individual outside the Senate. What I have to say represents my own thought alone.

The phrase "good offices" as contained in the concurrent resolution and also in my own amendment is most important. Those are key words and agreement on their meaning is essential. According to the dictionary, "good offices" means a mild form of mediation. One contemporary authority states that "good offices" consists merely in either bringing representatives of the disputing parties together for discussion, perhaps under the presidency of the third party, or in passing between the disputants written proposals and counterproposals. In any case, he continues, the third party refrains from giving opinions or advice upon the substance of the question.

In Hackworth's Digest of International Law we find:

The term "good offices" concerns various kinds of action tending to call negotiations between the conflicting states into existence. Good offices consists in a friendly interposition of a third party to adjust differences and lead to a pacific solution of the dispute between two powers at variance.

Those definitions constitute the most authoritative meaning that I can find and seem to be acceptable. Whatever follows those two words, good offices, in the Senate pronouncement on the Palestine issue should not be in discord with their meaning. We also need to give thought, Mr. President, to what our words may signify to peoples other than the Jews who live in or near Palestine.

Now, in the concurrent resolution as reported, the United States is to use its "good offices with the mandatory power," that is, with Great Britain and, presumably, only Britain. The real disputants in the case appear to me to be the promoters of the Zionist movement or other organizations representing those who wish to live in Palestine on one hand, and the Arabs, who are living in Palestine or its vicinity, on the other. It seems most apparent that, if we are to be effective, our good offices should not even appear to be so directed that the Arab element is ignored.

The Arabs and their position are most important, Mr. President. Palestine has no natural borders and there are Arab communities and states on virtually all sides—notably Lebanon, Syria, and Saudi Arabia. Even Iraq and Egypt are so near to Palestine that the attitude of those states should also be taken into account as we apply our good offices. Those people are all Mohammedans, and Jerusalem is just as much of a holy city to them as it is to the Jews or to the Christians. There are 200,000,000 Mohammedans in the world, and most of them live in that general area.

We need not go into the characteristics of the Mohammedans other than to note that their religion is very important in their general psychology, that they have

fanatical tendencies, and that they can easily become most decidedly explosive. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the area has been an Arab home for centuries.

If we properly employ our good offices as such, it seems likely that we could accomplish more with the Arabs than could any other great power, simply because they are more likely to trust the efforts of the United States. We can easily lose that status by ill-judged use of our good offices. I submit, Mr. President, that we will be in danger of losing it if we follow the lines of the concurrent resolution as reported and act upon the terms as therein laid down.

As the resolution stands, our good offices are to be used, with Britain only, toward three ends. The first of them is set forth by the words "that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities." To me those words seem to mean that the full agricultural and industrial potential of Palestine is to be absorbed by the addition of Jews and of Jews alone. Those words do not say that there can be no further Arab immigration into Palestine, but it is difficult to see that those words are intended to mean anything other than just that. Moreover, that is what the Arabs are likely to think that the Senate means as the end in view.

Any effort by the mandatory power to that end will most likely be strongly opposed by the Arabs. In my opinion, there is grave danger that the opposition will include the direct use of force, which is a long distance from what "good offices" is intended to accomplish.

The second end set forth in the concurrent resolution is somewhat less definite, but the objective is quite similar. The words of the concurrent resolution are "that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development so that they—the Jews—may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine." That says "full opportunity" and "freely proceed" by the Jewish people. The clause does not mention other peoples, even those already living in Palestine. There again, Mr. President, if we of the Congress really mean what the concurrent resolution says, we should foresee that what begins with the simple use of our good offices may lead far too easily to conditions under which force may become the arbiter. The concurrent resolution is discordant, and the amendment which I have proposed is intended to correct the defect.

The third objective stated in the resolution can be interpreted as part of the second purpose just discussed; but there seems to be no certainty that it will be understood as such. It does finally recognize the fact that there are people other than the Jews living in Palestine, and goes on to express a goal with which no one should quarrel. The words are, "in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights."

I believe that the word "commonwealth" is questioned by some who worry

about this resolution, but I myself raise no point about it.

I believe that the third objective is entirely proper and is fully in accord with the thinking and sentiment of this country. At least the resolution as written does end on a good note which is not out of harmony with the meaning of the phrase "good offices."

Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 deals with a subject in foreign relations which is far from unimportant. The Senate Committee, I understand, reported that resolution with only one dissenting vote. Not being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and not knowing the considerations which guided the members in their deliberations, I have hesitated to speak on this matter. I do so partly in the fear that, under the pressure of public duties which have been with us over the past few weeks, one of the fundamentals in the conduct of foreign relations may have been overlooked. That fundamental is that the United States should not lay out a course and should not adopt a line of foreign policy which may lead to the clash of arms unless we first answer two questions in the affirmative.

One of those questions is the ready availability of our forces in case the pursuit of such policy should unfortunately lead to open conflict. The other question is, Would we be entirely willing to use that force if the policy which we adopt should be opposed to the point of war? History is replete with instances when that fundamental in the conduct of foreign relations has been forgotten. We ourselves have figured in some of those instances.

It is quite true, Mr. President, that the concurrent resolution as reported says only that we shall use our "good offices with the mandatory power." However, when we go on to indicate that the Congress expects to open Palestine for the entry of Jews alone, to the maximum of the country's potentialities, and that we intend that the Jews may freely proceed with the upbuilding of that country for their own purposes, perhaps without even asking the wishes of the Arabs, who now constitute a majority of the population, then we face the danger of serious involvement for which we may not be prepared. If we are only urging Britain to efforts along these lines, it is quite true that we make no definite commitment which may lead to the use of our armed forces.

From that viewpoint, Mr. President, the question then arises: Are we fair in asking Britain, as the mandatory power, to take measures which to the Arabs will seem extreme and which will vitally affect their interests, unless we are prepared to join Britain in accepting responsibility for whatever involvement may result? To put it more bluntly, will we have the military power available and will we be resolved to use it in assisting the British to the ends now set forth in the resolution? I submit, Mr. President, that if the Senate votes upon the resolution as it now stands, Senators should have that contingency very clearly in mind.

Mr. President, I share the horror and resentment aroused by the treatment of the Jewish people in Europe at the hands

of the Nazis. I hold in full measure the great sympathy which is felt for those persecuted people by the civilized world. The Jewish remnants in central Europe deserve all that we can do in a practical way to alleviate their plight. So far as the use of our good offices is concerned, I submit that we could well employ them in central Europe, where the remnants of the race are still living. Those people are now where, for the most part, they have always been. They have every right to treatment by the non-Jewish elements there which will make their present state and their future prospects fully as good as they were before the Nazis perpetrated those horrible crimes. Those countries in central Europe are all under our allies of this war, and the Congress could well resolve in emphatic language that our good offices should be employed with those Allies in order that the plight of the Jews in Europe may be alleviated at once. We should be able to get much quicker results that way than the Zionist project in Palestine can possibly achieve, because at best that project would take considerable time.

I am entirely ready to join with my colleagues in any action along that line which gives promise of rescue for the Jewish people of Europe. The concurrent resolution is understood to have that immediate end in view; but it is not practical for that purpose and I cannot join in its approval.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed is much like Senate Joint Resolution 112, which was introduced by three Senators, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and which I assume was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. My amendment would make the resolution read something like that, and it is not open to the objections which I have raised to Senate Concurrent Resolution 44 as it now stands. It would give full scope and play in the use of our good offices, instead of confining them to the mandatory power. It would not put Congress in the position of saying that the United States should pursue certain policies which could involve this Nation in further hostilities. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, for whose judgment I have high regard, if when he made the important change suggested by his amendment he considered the obligation which the United States assumed in the covenant between Britain and the United States, agreeing that His Britannic Majesty should administer the government of Palestine? Did he consider that question?

Mr. HART. Does the Senator refer back to the action of 1922?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. I refer to the covenant of December 3, 1924, a covenant which incorporated within its four corners the express terms of the mandate and solemnly agreed that His Britannic Majesty should administer that government. The question is excited by the

proposal that we offer to intervene between the wards, as it were, of His Britannic Majesty, both Arabs and Jews. I wonder if the Senator realizes that when we do that we are turning around on our promise that His Britannic Majesty should have the exclusive administration of Palestine. In other words, having made this agreement with Britain, how can we exercise the rights which we have and the obligations which we owe under that treaty, except through the mandatory power, Great Britain? I wonder how the Senator views that question.

Mr. HART. I believe that any answer or the opinion of anyone on that question must be colored by the fact that the President and the British Prime Minister have agreed upon the appointment of a joint committee of inquiry to examine into conditions in Palestine. Quite naturally, the legalistic aspect of the question—and that, I assume, is rather what the esteemed Senator from Vermont refers to—will receive full examination. It is to be remembered that after trying for 15 years—from 1924 to 1939—to effect an arrangement in Palestine which would be satisfactory to all parties concerned, the British finally were compelled to issue a White Paper rather admitting that they were unable to bring about such conditions, and proposing other measures, under which they would do far less than they had agreed to do. So far as I recall, that never received the approval of the League of Nations.

Today the status of the League of Nations is rather doubtful; we are not sure just what it is. Another factor now has entered upon the scene. I think it is article 106 of the Charter of the United Nations which makes provision for an interim arrangement. Under that article, four powers, as I recall, appear to have cognizance over the question.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the legal aspect of the matter, if we go back to the early 1920's, is rather buried by practical considerations.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator consider that we go back a single moment from today in respect to the obligations under that treaty? Are we not bound today, and until that treaty is abrogated, by its terms, its obligations, and its duties?

I am not asking anyone to go back to 1924. I am only asking that we adhere to the obligations of this moment in considering this very dangerous resolution. I fought, as I suppose the committee will assure the Senator, the original wording of the resolution, primarily because it went away beyond the terms of the mandate and beyond the terms of the treaty. Any justification for doing that which may have been contained in statements of distinguished men of those times, I am not willing to accept. I am willing only to go according to the obligations and duties and rights which were established by the mandate and by the treaty which we entered into with Great Britain. If we do that, we shall be on a ground which cannot be the cause of an armed dispute. If we stay within our own jurisdiction,

namely, our relations to the mandatory power, we shall not give the rest of the world cause to complain that we have broken into a matter where we have no right to intrude.

I wish to adhere to a position which will be legalistically correct, on account of the consequences which may arise from adhering to a position which may be illegal as to a great government.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I see no conflict whatever between the resolution as I propose to amend it and the situation under our covenant which the Senator has set forth. I see no conflict there.

The other point the Senator raised was that we are not involving ourselves in a commitment. I gave my answer to that in the body of my remarks.

Then the question arises, Is it fair for us to urge upon the mandatory power, the British Government, with all the emphasis which this body can put upon the power which now carries all the responsibility, that it should do things involving responsibilities which we are not willing to help it carry?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I answer that by saying it is not fair. That is why I wish to have us be in a strictly legal position with respect to the mandatory.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, let me say that I have listened patiently and as well as I could to the argument made by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut in proposing his amendment. I am sorry to say I could not hear all of it. However, as I understand the amendment, it would make very substantial changes in the concurrent resolution which has been reported to the Senate. The distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut stated that he thought the Foreign Relations Committee, because of the pressure of other duties, had overlooked the fundamental questions which he wished to bring to our attention.

I may say briefly that the short history of the concurrent resolution is as follows: Several resolutions relating to Palestine were introduced in the Senate and were referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee, after a discussion of them, voted to appoint a special subcommittee to investigate and make a report. The committee itself had a meeting with the Secretary of State. The subcommittee had two meetings with the Secretary of State. They met with other interested Senators. They met with other interested citizens who asked to be heard. They gave consideration to all the facts which have been brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut and they gave consideration to all other related facts. After that careful consideration, they decided that none of the resolutions which had been presented to them met the situation, in their opinion. It was very difficult to arrive at an agreement among the different points of view, but I am glad to say that in a spirit of conciliation and explanation finally the common purpose of all of them was expressed in the concurrent resolution which the subcommittee drafted and reported to the full committee. The full committee gave it consideration and discussion, with a knowledge of all the facts

which the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut seems to think he alone has discovered.

The result was that the committee voted 17 to 1 to report the resolution to the Senate. I hope the resolution will be adopted without change. It has been very difficult to reach a common agreement in regard to phraseology so delicate as that of the resolution, but the desired result has been achieved, and I certainly hope the resolution will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, it is with the deepest regret that I have to take issue with my colleague the respected junior Senator from Connecticut, to whose remarks on this subject I listened with great interest. As I understand the concurrent resolution in the form in which it has been reported by the committee, it calls upon the British Government to fulfill the obligation which it undertook many long years ago. We hereby resolve that we are going to urge, and use our good offices to see, that the Government which is now in charge of the Kingdom of Great Britain shall fulfill the policy which they proclaimed many times before they came into power.

I refer to a speech which I made on this subject on October 2, 1945. Upon looking at it I note that I quoted the official declaration on Palestine of the British Labor Party, the party which is now in control of Great Britain, and I should like to read it again into the RECORD, because I think it should be emphasized. This is what the British Labor Party said before it came into power:

There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a "Jewish national home," unless we are prepared to let Jews, if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war. There is an irresistible case now, after the unspeakable atrocities of the cold and calculated German Nazi plan to kill all Jews in Europe. \* \* \* The Arabs have many wide territories of their own; they must not claim to exclude the Jews from this small area of Palestine less than the size of Wales.

That, Mr. President, was the declaration of the men who now constitute the ruling power in Great Britain. As I understand the pending resolution, we are going to call upon them, now that they have assumed the responsibility of office, to carry out what they stated to be their principles before they assumed their present responsibilities.

Mr. President, we can do no less than to nail the pending concurrent resolution to our masthead and say, "Here is our position; here is where we stand."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the argument which was presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

There are three essential differences between the concurrent resolution and the amendment. In the first place, where the concurrent resolution states: "Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maxi-

mum of its agricultural and economic potentialities," the amendment would say, "Palestine shall be opened for entry of Jews into that country."

At the present time 1,500 Jews a month are allowed to enter Palestine. One of the issues is free entry to the limit of Palestine's economic possibilities. I should be unwilling to agree to any change in that respect in the concurrent resolution.

Secondly, the concurrent resolution provides that "There shall be full opportunity for colonization and development." The amendment says only "opportunity." That also is a definite issue. Today there is an opportunity for colonization of about 1 percent of all the land in Palestine. I do not think we want to make any change there.

Thirdly, there is an omission in the amendment of the words "the United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power," and so forth. The suggestion is made that we should use our good offices with everyone. I think the distinguished Senator will admit that the words "good offices" do not mean war or armies. They mean peaceful offices. They certainly cannot mean that the good offices are confined to the British because we certainly are not going to war with Britain.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HART. Does the Senator believe that we are entirely fair in urging upon Great Britain rather extreme measures, or measures which the Arabs believe to be rather extreme—without being willing to share the responsibility which will follow, even to the extent of permitting the use of our own forces?

Mr. TAFT. For all practical purposes, for almost 20 years the British have administered Palestine as a British colony. They have full economic advantage of whatever may take place in Palestine. Palestine is today a part of the sterling area. I have letters from American importers who desire to ship goods into Palestine and cannot do so because the British refuse to allow them to ship goods into that country. The British are in full control in Palestine. We have no right to go to the Arab states nearby and discuss with them what we will do in Palestine. We have no part of the country. Before talking with ibn-Saud, President Roosevelt discussed the matter with Churchill and obtained his permission to discuss the matter with ibn-Saud. I think the President made a great mistake in discussing it with ibn-Saud, because I do not believe that ibn-Saud was the man with whom the President should have discussed the matter. I think we would make a great mistake were we to try to discuss the matter with the Arab nations in the Middle East. In the first place, the British agreed in the mandate of the League of Nations to do this. As it has been pointed out by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], in 1924 we made a special treaty with Great Britain under which she agreed to carry out the mandate which she had assumed from the League of Nations in return for various things which we agreed to do. I assert that they now have a direct treaty

obligation with us to carry out the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. President, I think it is very serious to suggest that the President use his good offices and ask the British to carry out a treaty obligation which they have to the world, and to the United States in particular.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I believe I did not make my question clear. I was speaking of the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 44. Those terms indicate that rather extreme measures are to be taken in Palestine insofar as the Arabs are concerned.

My question referred to the situation which might arise under the resolution. I asked the Senator if he believed that we should be ready to accept any share of a responsibility which might result from any trouble which might ensue.

Mr. TAFT. That depends on what the Senator means by sharing the responsibility. We are saying by the concurrent resolution what we think should be done. We are not assuming to say that we are going to send any troops, or do anything else beyond saying that we hope to use our good offices with the mandatory power, and call their attention to their treaty obligations. If the British chose to say in return, "You take Palestine, that question is a new thing to us," that is one thing. But, up to the moment, they have shown no indication of any such intention. I personally would not be in favor of assuming such a responsibility.

Mr. HART. I gather that the Senator is not in favor of our sending troops into Palestine in the event a necessity arose for them. Will the Senator state why he thinks ibn-Saud was not a proper representative for President Roosevelt to confer with?

Mr. TAFT. It is because ibn-Saud had never previously had any relations in a political way with Palestine. He never had any jurisdiction over Palestine. Palestine was never a part of Saudi Arabia. Both countries were parts of the Turkish Empire. Palestine was set up with an Arab leader as a special state for the purpose of making it into a Jewish commonwealth. It was so understood by the Arabs at the time, and I see no reason for consulting the heads of other states with regard to the matter when they have no direct relation with the obligations which the British assumed in Palestine.

Mr. HART. I merely observe that according to my understanding ibn-Saud is the leader of the Pan-Arabic Organization, and that makes him count for a good deal.

Mr. TAFT. The Pan-Arabic Organization, so far as I know, has no official status of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall say just a few words. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and I were appointed a subcommittee, and we worked for 2 weeks on this resolution, the others working harder than I myself did. Later there was consultation with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. WALSH], I believe, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Then there were consultations with others, and, so far as I know, there had been no objection on the part of those who had taken an interest in the matter up to that time.

This resolution has been as carefully studied as any I have known of, and I think it is generally satisfactory. I think that even the one vote that was cast in the committee against it, which has been referred to, was not because of the language of the resolution itself, but was cast on another ground.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the correction of a mistake in the language of the report which was made when the resolution was sent to the Senate. In the fourth line from the bottom of the report the language is, "and where they can establish," and so forth. That means the Jews. That does not correspond to the language of the resolution itself. There should be inserted there the words "in association with all elements of the population." For the sake of the future historian I should like to have the correction made, in order that there may be no misapprehension.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the correction in the report or in the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GREEN. In the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to detain the Senate. I should much prefer not to say anything, but I feel it to be my duty to say a few words to the Senate to explain my position in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Texas voted against reporting the resolution, not because he was lacking in sympathy for the Jewish people, not because he did not want to see the stateless and homeless Jews of Europe immigrate to Palestine, but according to my view we are going about this matter in the wrong way.

In the first place, this is not a primary United States responsibility. Under the League of Nations Great Britain received a mandate for Palestine. We were not members of the League of Nations. In 1922 we adopted a resolution expressing sympathy with the Jewish people, and the hope that Great Britain would permit immigration into Palestine. I do not recall the exact language of the resolution. Great Britain has been permitting immigration into Palestine. At the present moment I think the quota is 1,500 a month. The Jewish people think that is not sufficient.

Mr. President, what I rose to say was that the President of the United States is the constitutional representative of the Nation in its foreign relations. The President has been undertaking to discharge his functions with regard to this particular matter. On the 31st of August 1945 he addressed a letter to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I have a copy of the letter. I shall not undertake to read it, because I do not want to consume time, but I ask permission that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Because of the natural interest of this Government in the present condition and future fate of those displaced persons in Germany who may prove to be stateless or nonrepatriable, we recently sent Mr. Earl G. Harrison to inquire into the situation.

Mr. Harrison was formerly the United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and is now the representative of this Government on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. The United Kingdom and the United States, as you know, have taken an active interest in the work of this Committee.

Instructions were given to Mr. Harrison to inquire particularly into the problems and needs of the Jewish refugees among the displaced persons.

Mr. Harrison visited not only the American zone in Germany but spent some time also in the British zone where he was extended every courtesy by the Twenty-first Army headquarters.

I have now received his report. In view of our conversations at Potsdam I am sure that you will find certain portions of the report interesting. I am, therefore, sending you a copy.

I should like to call your attention to the conclusions and recommendations appearing on page 8 and the following pages—especially the references to Palestine. It appears that the available certificates for immigration to Palestine will be exhausted in the near future. It is suggested that the granting of an additional 100,000 of such certificates would contribute greatly to a sound solution for the future of Jews still in Germany and Austria, and for other Jewish refugees who do not wish to remain where they are or who for understandable reasons do not desire to return to their countries of origin.

On the basis of this and other information which has come to me I concur in the belief that no other single matter is so important for those who have known the horrors of concentration camps for over a decade as is the future of immigration possibilities into Palestine. The number of such persons who wish immigration to Palestine or who would qualify for admission there is, unfortunately, no longer as large as it was before the Nazis began their extermination program. As I said to you in Potsdam, the American people, as a whole, firmly believe that immigration into Palestine should not be closed and that a reasonable number of Europe's persecuted Jews should, in accordance with their wishes, be permitted to resettle there.

I know you are in agreement on the proposition that future peace in Europe depends in large measure upon our finding sound solutions of problems confronting the displaced and formerly persecuted groups of people. No claim is more meritorious than that of the groups who for so many years have known persecution and enslavement.

The main solution appears to lie in the quick evacuation of as many as possible of the nonrepatriable Jews, who wish it, to Palestine. If it is to be effective, such action should not be long delayed.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish also to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the President under date of November 13, slightly over a month ago. It refers to an agreement the President made with the Prime Minister

of Great Britain. The President's statement reads:

Following the receipt of information from various sources regarding the distressing situation of the Jewish victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution in Europe, I wrote to Mr. Attlee on August 31 bringing to his attention the suggestion in a report of Mr. Earl G. Harrison that the granting of an additional 100,000 certificates for the immigration of Jews into Palestine would alleviate the situation. A copy of my letter to Mr. Attlee is being made available to the press. I continue to adhere to the views expressed in that letter.

I was advised by the British Government that because of conditions in Palestine it was not in a position to adopt the policy recommended, but that it was deeply concerned with the situation of the Jews in Europe. During the course of subsequent discussions between the two Governments, it suggested the establishment of a joint Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry, under a rotating chairmanship, to examine the whole question and to make a further review of the Palestine problem in the light of that examination and other relevant considerations.

In view of our intense interest in this matter and of our belief that such a committee will be of aid in finding a solution which will be both humane and just, we have acceded to the British suggestion.

The terms of reference of this committee, as agreed upon between the two Governments, are as follows:

To examine political, economic, and social conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement therein and the well-being of the peoples now living therein.

How many Members of the Senate know those conditions? A few who have traveled there in recent years know them, but most Senators do not. I am frank to say that the Senator now speaking does not know.

The statement continues:

2. To examine the position of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution, and the practical measures taken or contemplated to be taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression and to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe.

3. To hear the views of competent witnesses and to consult representative Arabs and Jews on the problems of Palestine as such problems are affected by conditions subject to examination under paragraphs 1 and 2 above and by other relevant facts and circumstances, and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for ad interim handling of these problems as well as for their permanent solution.

4. To make such other recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States as may be necessary to meet the immediate needs arising from conditions subject to examination under paragraph 2 above, by remedial action in the European countries in question or by the provision of facilities for emigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe.

It will be observed that among the important duties of this committee will be the task of examining conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration. The establishment of this committee will make possible a prompt review of the unfortunate plight of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been subjected to persecution, and a prompt

examination of questions related to the rate of current immigration into Palestine and the absorptive capacity of the country.

The situation faced by displaced Jews in Europe during the coming winter allows no delay in this matter. I hope the committee will be able to accomplish its important task with the greatest speed.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a question. Does he not think that the adoption of this resolution by the Senate now will be an indication, and a wise indication, of the direction in which we wish our delegates to go in the negotiations with the British? I am supporting the concurrent resolution. I have had all the difficulties and doubts which have been expressed, but I think the resolution is in such form that it conforms fully with the treaty obligations, with the Balfour Declaration, and with the plight in which we find the poor Jews in Europe. It seems to me the delegates to the joint conference will be strengthened rather than weakened by having the Senate adopt the concurrent resolution. I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether he does not agree with that conclusion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the conclusion, if the Congress is going to overthrow the President's control of the matter and take it over, but I think it is most unwise. We are dealing with Great Britain. The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have mutually agreed to appoint a commission to go to Palestine to investigate all these questions and to bring back a report on the facts. They have agreed to do it within 120 days. A distinguished committee has been appointed to represent the United States, and in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York times telling who the commissioners of the United States are to be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, BRITAIN PICK 12 TO STUDY PALESTINE—TRUMAN CALLS JUDGE HUTCHESON TO SHARE CHAIRMANSHIP WITH SIR JOHN E. SINGLETON—BROAD INQUIRY ORDERED—COMMITTEE TOLD TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS IN EUROPE AND TO CONSULT ARABS AND JEWS

WASHINGTON, December 10.—President Truman named today a six-member group to represent United States interests on the British-American Committee of Inquiry on the Palestine question. The chairman is Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, of the Fifth Circuit Court, of Houston, Tex.

Membership of the committee of 12 was announced simultaneously in Washington and London under terms of reference calling for the "utmost expedition in dealing with the subjects committed to it for investigation" and for a report to the 2 Governments within 120 days of the inception of the inquiry. When the investigation will begin the White House was unable to say.

Members of the American group, besides Judge Hutcheson, include Frank Aydelotte, former president of Swarthmore College and now director of the Institute for the Advanced Study at Princeton and American secretary of the Rhodes Trust.

#### EDITOR IS APPOINTED

Others are Frank W. Buxton, editor of the Boston Herald; O. Max Gardner, former Governor of North Carolina and a Washington attorney; James G. McDonald, former chairman of the Foreign Policy Association and High Commissioner of German Refugees for the League of Nations; and William Phillips, former Under Secretary of State, Ambassador to Italy, Presidential representative in New Delhi, India, and delegate to the London Naval Conference in 1935.

Sir John E. Singleton, judge of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, was named chairman of the British delegation and will alternate with Judge Hutcheson as a chairman of the two-power group under an agreed-on plan of rotation.

A White House announcement said: "The procedure of the committee will be determined by the committee itself, and it will be open to it, if it thinks fit, to deal simultaneously through the medium of subcommittees with its various terms of reference."

#### OTHER BRITONS NAMED

British committeemen include Wilfred P. Crick, economic adviser to the Midland Bank; Richard S. Crossman, Labor Member of Parliament and former assistant editor of the New Statesman and Nation; Sir Frederick Leggett, former Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Labor and National Services; Maj. Reginald E. Manningham-Butler, Conservative Member of Parliament; and Lord Morrison, Labor Member of Parliament.

The terms of reference of the Committee were:

1. To examine political, economic, and social conditions in Palestine as they bear upon the problem of Jewish immigration and settlement therein and the well-being of the peoples now living therein.

2. To examine the position of the Jews in those countries in Europe where they have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution and the practical measures taken or contemplated to be taken in those countries to enable them to live free from discrimination and oppression and to make estimates of those who wish or will be impelled by their conditions to migrate to Palestine or other countries outside Europe.

3. To hear the views of competent witnesses and to consult representative Arabs and Jews on the problems of Palestine as such problems are affected by conditions subject to examination under paragraphs 1 and 2 above, and by other relevant facts and circumstances, and to make recommendations to His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for ad interim handling of these problems as well as for their permanent solution.

4. To make such other recommendations to His Majesty's Government and to the Government of the United States as may be necessary to meet the immediate needs arising from conditions subject to examination under paragraph 2 above by remedial action in the European countries in question or by the provision of facilities for emigration to and settlement in countries outside Europe.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that as the Chairman of the United States group the President has appointed Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson, of my State. He is a distinguished member of the Fifth Circuit Court, of Houston, Tex., a man of the highest public character, education, and experience.

Mr. President, the point I am making, I will say to the Senator from New Jersey, is that the President of the United States does not want this resolution adopted. He so told the Foreign Relations Committee—not in person, but he told me over the telephone and authorized me to

tell the committee, and I did tell the committee what he said. He stated, "I do not regard adoption of the resolution as advisable. I do not want to see any sort of resolution adopted until the Commission can conduct its inquiry and submit its report." I reported that to the committee.

The Secretary of State appeared before the committee and testified that the resolution ought not to be adopted and that it was not wise, and that he opposed it.

Yet, Mr. President, the committee could not wait 4 months. It could not wait 120 days. It had to rush this resolution through.

Mr. President, those are my reasons for objecting to the adoption of the resolution at the present time.

Furthermore, I believe the resolution is calculated not to help the Jews, but to injure their causes. Great Britain is not going to be persuaded by a resolution which she does not want adopted. I assume she does not want it adopted, because I assume that she is expecting to go through with the machinery of this Commission, and to wait its report. I do not believe it is in the interest of the Jews at this time to adopt the resolution.

I shall not argue the situation in regard to the Jews. All Senators know the facts. Senators have seen in the press that the Arab League is bitterly opposed to the contemplated action of the United States Congress in adopting this resolution.

Mr. President, with the utmost sympathy for the Jews, with the utmost sympathy for those in this country who are sympathizing with their brethren in Europe, I must in the interest of my country vote against the adoption of this resolution at the present time. I shall vote against it because, under the circumstances, I do not believe the President of the United States should assume the obligation of handling this matter, that Great Britain does not want a resolution of this kind adopted, and that the Secretary of State, who is in touch with the international situation, does not want any resolutions adopted at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate as long as I really should like to do, for the reason that there is not much on the record to show why we ought to act, and why we should act now on this subject. I think the facts are so cogent that they should be on the record. In order to conserve the time of Senators who are weary, I shall refer only to a few things and then ask permission to insert in the RECORD some reports made by a Commission called the Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Commission, which studied the crisis in Palestine when it was at its peak. The report was made in October 1936, and as an introduction to the report the Commission said, over the signatures of its members, among other things:

Our own Government, however, cannot be held blameless until it calls sharply to the attention of Great Britain our feeling that the mandate is not being administered as it

should be. No matter how pressing may be the demands of a Presidential election, time out must be taken to have the atrocities in Palestine stopped. We cannot shed our own responsibility until we remind Great Britain of its neglected duty and insist upon its performance.

The members of our group will do whatever possible to impress our Government with what appears to us to be its manifest duty. To this end we shall do all we can to fulfill the international obligation, to which our Government is a party, to establish the Jewish National Home in Palestine, with full justice to Moslem and Christian in the Holy Land.

ROYAL S. COPELAND,  
DANIEL O. HASTINGS,  
WARREN R. AUSTIN.

Mr. President, I regard it a duty at this time to place in the RECORD in some way the facts to which we were witnesses at that time and to which I am a witness now. Because of the nature of the amendment proposed, I briefly refer to the legalistic position which I have taken in interrogating the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

The United States became a party to the mandate by virtue of the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924. It will suffice to refer to two articles in order that it may be perfectly clear that we owe an obligation here, and there is a definite country to which we owe that obligation.

ARTICLE 1. Subject to the provisions of the present convention the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above.

In other words, every detail of that mandate is something that the United States Government has gotten behind in a solemn way and we said, "We accept His Britannic Majesty as the trustee of this great trust. We will not only let His Britannic Majesty perform so long as His Majesty does perform according thereto, but we will be vigilant to perform our duty to our nationals living in Palestine and to all the other wards of that trust, by calling direct and vigorous attention to what we regard as a breach of the trust, a nonperformance of the mandate."

The other article is this:

ART. 7. Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

Now I ask: Can we stand by after having had brought to our attention, without any opportunity for doubt, very important particulars in which the mandatory is not administering Palestine according to this treaty and is thereby in effect changing the mandate? Is it not equally important for us to try to hold the mandatory to the terms of the treaty in regard to his administration of it as it is to hold the mandatory to the terms of the treaty in regard to a formal amendment of it, particularly when we find this type of change made by practice, namely, cutting down of the area of land into which Jews are permitted to immigrate? That was one of the early changes in the mandate, made without any formal action, by the sole act of the mandatory power. All of Transjordan was cut off from the area of Palestine which was originally

comprehended in the terms of the mandate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HART. Was not that action approved by the League of Nations?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not. I do not know. Certainly I have never seen any approval of it, and I think it would have been called to my attention in 1936 if there had been any such record.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In any event, it is entirely clear that the white paper has never been approved by the League of Nations or the United States. That goes very much further.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is distinctly right. Most Senators also recognize, I am sure, that such a formal change as that would have to come to the United States and be approved by the United States under the terms of our treaty with Britain, and that certainly never has been done.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not also true that as parties to this treaty, if we continue silently to acquiesce in its violation, which is admitted on all sides, we then lend our acquiescence, and that an estoppel will operate?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not ready to say that. I once learned in a lawsuit that silence under certain circumstances is probative. Silence under circumstances in which a man or a nation ought to speak is probative.

I am going only a little way into this story, but I go this far: Aside from the treaty, we were asked by Britain to make her load as light as possible, to help her. Lord Balfour, the author of the resolution which is recited in the preamble of this concurrent resolution, wrote to Secretary of State Hughes on January 13, 1922, during the negotiation of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, as follows:

The task which the British Government have undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. . . . However this may be, the duty has devolved upon Great Britain, and I hope the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load.

In the report which I have before me appear two short paragraphs which I wish to read, because they were fresh when they were written, with the facts immediately before me:

American public sentiment should be frankly expressed in support of the mandate and in approval of its strict administration according to the British policy laid down during the negotiation of its terms. It would strengthen the arm of the mandatory and discourage the employment of violence and civil disobedience to induce either the abrogation of the mandate or a modification of its essential obligations.

Again, quoting from another part:

In fulfillment of the principles of the mandate and the declared policy of the mandatory power, a stable supporting public sentiment among the American people, frankly announced, may be of great value. It may help to lighten the load assumed by the mandatory, in accordance with the spirit of Lord Balfour's letter to Secretary of State

Hughes, in the performance of the great task of establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine.

With respect to the terms of Concurrent Resolution 44, it will be noticed that it does not declare for a Jewish state. That was the supreme issue in the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and the original draft was changed in that particular and peculiar regard to make it absolutely clear that we were not asking the mandatory to go beyond the terms of the treaty or of the mandate itself and undertake by bayonets—and that is what it would ultimately mean—to set up a Jewish state anywhere, certainly not in a tiny land which is in a humble position as a result of the war.

The language of the resolution recognizes the other nationalities. There are approximately 60 of them. The population of Palestine is not all Jew and Arab. To be found there are the Christian religion, the Moslem or Mohammedan religion, the Hebrew religion, and various cults. There are many sacred shrines which must be respected according to the terms of the mandate.

On the point of a Jewish state, I think only this language is necessary to bring to light the essential difference between the original resolution which was offered and the one now pending, which is Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 44. This is taken from a Government paper published while we were negotiating our treaty with Great Britain. It became a royal instruction. It contained the following language:

A Jewish national home will be founded in Palestine. The Jewish people will be in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. But His Majesty's government have no such aim as that Palestine should become as Jewish as England is English.

Nor do His Majesty's government contemplate the disappearance or subordination of the Arab population, language, or culture. The status of all citizens of Palestine will be Palestinian, and no section of the population will have any other status in the eyes of the law.

We entered into the treaty with that language before us. Who can now say that we would be doing a wise act if, as the Senate of the United States, we should adopt a resolution calling upon the mandatory to establish a Jewish state? Much as I am devoted to the cause of the Jews, I cannot bring myself to that point, primarily because I know that the repercussion from such a position would do the Jews more harm than anything they have suffered in the long, long centuries. Their prospects would not have the promise and hope that they now have, and that they would have by the adoption of a resolution which is reasonable and which recognizes the rights, according to the Balfour Declaration, of other peoples, religions, and shrines in Palestine.

I quote from the concurrent resolution. This is the point:

So that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home—

Note the following—  
and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men,

regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

I have talked with many Jews. I have talked with some of the leading rabbis of the world about this matter. During our last consideration of it this note, which was finally adopted by the State Department, came to the committee through the hands of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] from three brilliant Jews who drafted the language.

In my opinion this recognition of the status of all people who live there is the proper attitude for the United States Senate to take, while undertaking to say to the mandate, "Open the doors of Palestine to the free immigration of Jews and to the full settlement of the land. Do not answer us by saying, 'No; we cannot do it; the land will not support them all; it will not support all the population that is there and the additional ones that come in.' That will not do at all."

The facts which I shall introduce, if I am permitted to do so—I shall ask unanimous consent to have them placed in the RECORD—show that immigration is a dynamic thing, that Palestine has never arrived at the limit of her capacity to receive immigration, and that all the time she has been receiving just as many Arabs as Jews. Her doors have been open to them all, and they have come in; but, as I have said, Palestine has not yet reached the limit of her capacity to receive immigration or her capacity for agricultural development.

The resolution provides a limit, for it says:

Shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Can the Senator inform me whether there is any restriction on the immigration of Arabs at the present time, or whether there has been in recent years?

Mr. AUSTIN. None that I know of.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not rather extraordinary, in questioning the good faith with which the mandate has been administered, that we find that the Arab population has actually increased more than has the Jewish population, during the 20 years since Palestine was promised as a homeland for the Jew?

Mr. AUSTIN. Senator Copeland discussed that point fully, and he said it is not the result of an increased birth rate, but is the result of the improvement in water supply, the extension and development of cultivatable lands, education, better control of disease, higher level of wages, higher standard of living, and similar factors which make a country productive. That is what causes the Arabs to flock into Palestine. They go there in order to enjoy the dynamic power which has come to Palestine. Please understand, it is almost a visible thing. The spirit of the people is most amazing. It is miraculous how they have had a rebirth, how happy they are,

and how they have swung into this project of restoring the Holy Land, the home of their fathers, to great productivity, and to get upon that sacred soil.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but before yielding I should like to place in the RECORD something which is an admission by the mandatory. This is taken from the report of the Palestine Royal Commission, submitted at London in 1937:

The Jews in Palestine, to begin with, are happy. They are not as happy as they were before the outbreak of the last war. . . . But, speaking generally, whether it be the Jew who has been driven from a comfortable life in a cultured "mellieu" and is now digging all the day in the fields and sleeping in a bare cottage, or whether it be the Jew who has emerged from a Polish ghetto and is now working in a factory at Tel Aviv, the dominant feeling of both is an overwhelming sense of escape. The champions of Zionism have always held—and on the whole they are now proved right—that a Jew released from an anti-Jewish environment and restored to Palestine would not only feel free as he had never felt before but would also acquire a new self-confidence, a new zest in living from his consciousness that he was engaged in a great constructive task.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have these papers printed in the RECORD. They prove that the Jews are engaged in a great, constructive task, and that they have accomplished miracles, thus far, and give great promise for the future.

Now I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, assuming that the Arabs who were living there at the time of the League of Nations mandate and the treaty with the United States have their rights which are fully provided for and protected, can it be said that the 600,000 Arabs who have come there from outside or who have appeared there in the new population during this period can claim any similar rights of protection, inasmuch as Palestine had been promised, and under the mandate and the trusteeship was designed, as a homeland for the Jew? If there is any saturation point, do not the Jews have priority, insofar as new immigration is concerned?

Mr. AUSTIN. My answer will have to be "No." In my opinion it is "No." I think the Arabs are there as a matter of right. They have not violated the law by entering Palestine. They are just as much citizens as if they had been born there or had gone there when the other inhabitants went there. Being there as citizens, it is only one of the incidents which I regard as a failure to administer the mandate strictly that there has not been the immigration of Jews, the fostering of the development of a form of government which will advance the Jewish national home, and all the other provisions which are provided for in the mandate. It is a failure to go through with those things which have caused the slow-down. The slow-down has been caused by unduly limiting the number of Jews who could enter that country. The Arabs, at the time when I was there, were clamoring to cut off the immigration entirely. They did not succeed in that, but they succeeded in having it limited.

I wish to say before I conclude that not all Arabs are opposed to having the Jews go to Palestine. Some of the finest of them told us—and I took verbatim minutes of their statements, and some of them will be placed in the RECORD—that there is no reason why Jews and Arabs should not get along together in Palestine. They are cousins; and so far as the economic status of Arabs is concerned, they benefited in all kinds of ways by the coming of the Jews. So far as health, education, and culture are concerned, the Arabs have benefited by the coming of the Jews. The only point was that those who were so strenuous in their efforts and desires to cut off the further immigration of Jews had a great fear of being overwhelmed by the Jewish population, so that ultimately, some time in the future, the Government of Palestine would become Jewish.

What I hope to see the mandatory do is carry out the policy expressed in this concurrent resolution, which looks to a government formed as we form one here in the United States—not based on a racial stock but containing many racial stocks whose nationals shall not be known as either Jew or Arab but—just as we are known as Americans—shall be known as Palestinians. If one race or another outstrips in population the other races, that is in the hands of the Almighty, and we do not have much to say about it.

Mr. President, I conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the reports of the Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Connecticut raised a very important point, namely, that the action which we are requested to take might conceivably lead to hostilities, and involve a question of responsibility. I feel that if we ask the British to take action, we should be willing to assume our share of the responsibility for it, and my belief is that it would then put the matter into the hands of the United Nations Organization. Is that that the Senator's judgment?

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator give me an opportunity to reply without saying "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. SMITH. I think the United Nations Organization is the organization to be concerned with the entire problem.

Mr. AUSTIN. We now have a commission which was appointed jointly by the mandatory and by the United States Government to investigate these facts. We will learn from that Commission the facts which we do not now have. We will obtain a better foundation for a decision concerning the precise character of changes which are to be made, than we have at the present time. We will perhaps learn whether it is possible to reach an agreement between Jews and Arabs. At one time an agreement was entered into. If the mandatory had adhered to the agreement and had hued to the line, we would not be where we are now in respect to the Palestine situation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the matter is handled rightly, I believe that it will be possible to secure another agreement. But if it is not possible to do so, undoubtedly Great Britain will be the actor. She now has power under the United Nations Charter to say whether she will give up her trusteeship to the United Nations, or to someone else. I doubt if it would be appropriate for us to make any recommendation. That is why I should not like to make any commitment or statement as to what should be done.

Mr. SMITH. My thought is that the situation might lead to participation on the part of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator from Vermont receive permission to have printed in the RECORD the reports to which he referred?

Mr. AUSTIN. I asked for such permission.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, I heard the Senator use the words "Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Committee." What kind of a committee is that?

Mr. AUSTIN. The name was probably given by Hearst, but it was a committee consisting of three Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. But it was not a committee which had been appointed by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was not a committee which had been appointed by the Senate. I should have said "commission." The Senate did not participate in the expense of the commission, or anything concerning it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I merely wanted to have that fact made clear.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was trying to identify the document.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not complaining to the Senator. I merely wanted it to be understood that when the Senator stated "Unofficial senatorial committee" the reports to which he referred were the reports of a purely voluntary committee and were not reports of a committee which had been appointed by the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the reports were not made by a committee authorized by the Senate. I have referred only to the title of the document so that the printer may know what I am talking about. The document is entitled "The Crisis in Palestine. Reports of Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Commission."

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if it were a Hearst commission, it was not a Senate commission or a Senate committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the document referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN PALESTINE—REPORTS OF HEARST UNOFFICIAL SENATORIAL COMMISSION  
PURPOSE OF THE INQUIRY

The following statement, issued by the members of the Unofficial Senatorial Commission on their arrival in Palestine on August 23, 1936, is reprinted from the Palestine Post:

"We have come to Palestine not as officials, but as citizens of the United States. We do

not commit the American Government by anything we say or do.

"Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the publisher of many newspapers in America, expressed to us the desire to get accurate and unbiased information concerning the situation in Palestine. We agreed to come here for that purpose.

"This is no official mission, but we are mindful of the fact that the information we hope to get will be of value to us as United States Senators.

"We are mindful of the fact that our Government is greatly interested in the problems of this country.

"We are mindful of Lord Balfour's historic letter to Secretary of State Hughes, of January 13, 1922, in which he expressed the hope that 'the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load' undertaken by the British Government in Palestine.

"If we can get accurate information and make an unbiased report, it ought to be helpful to the millions of Americans who are interested in the reconstruction of Palestine.

"We are here, free from all bias and prejudice. We seek reliable information and invite the aid of all who can help. We wish to hear from all sides, so everybody may be sure that our survey is conducted with strict impartiality.

"Regardless of religious or racial origin, all Americans have a genuine interest in the peace and prosperity of Palestine, a land sacred to Christian, Moslem, and Jew alike. In the midst of the world-wide depression from which our country suffered so deeply, we watched with admiration the great era of prosperity enjoyed by you.

"Our people have contributed greatly toward the reconstruction of Palestine, so as to confer benefits upon all elements of the population. We are confident that an early return to peace will insure the continuation of American economic aid to this country. And we pray that there may be unbroken progress on the part of all the people of the Holy Land toward an era of lasting prosperity."

"WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?"

The following statement, issued in New York by the members of the Unofficial Senatorial Commission on their return from Palestine, appeared in the New York American on September 18, 1936:

"We found Palestine in a state of terror. Shootings, bombings, and every other form of violence had become part of the daily routine during the past 5 months. Murder is a common occurrence. Nearly 1,000 lives have been lost in the present turmoil, including those of Arabs, Jews, and British soldiers.

"In spite of the fact that thoughtful Jewish and Arab leaders strive for mutual peace and lasting understanding, the intolerable state of affairs in Palestine continues. It is a condition for which, as we see it, the mandatory government must be held responsible. Its failure in this matter is of concern to the United States.

"Great Britain holds the mandatory power over Palestine. It is charged by the world with the responsibility for good government there. The United States has a treaty with the British sovereign, a treaty which includes every word of the original mandate designed to guarantee a Jewish national home in Palestine and to give unflinching justice to the Moslems and other religionists in the land.

"In consequence of the solemn treaty, it is our right, and probably our duty, as citizens and as United States Senators, to investigate and report upon the fulfillment of the convention which we believe is not being administered in accordance with its letter and spirit.

"We found the High Commissioner of Palestine to be a fine gentleman. In matters so fundamental, so vital to the welfare of Great Britain, so interlaced with the affairs of England in the Near East, we cannot

believe that the High Commissioner is acting upon his own initiative. Undoubtedly, he is an able and honest man, but open to the accusation of indecision and weakness, because he must be loyal to whatever is the 'policy' of the British Government.

"The failure to make conciliatory and peace-promoting moves culminated in the present 'strike,' with its horrible record of murders and destructive acts. Failure to deal sternly with the lawbreakers and to end the inexcusable acts of violence would bring discredit even to the police department of a second-class American city. All in all, there has been created a cleavage between Arab and Jew, which will take years to close. In the last analysis, the British Government must take the blame for the chaos in the Holy Land.

"Our own Government, however, cannot be held blameless until it calls sharply to the attention of Great Britain our feeling that the mandate is not being administered as it should be. No matter how pressing may be the demands of a Presidential election, time out must be taken to have the atrocities in Palestine stopped. We cannot shed our own responsibility until we remind Great Britain of its neglected duty and insist upon its performance.

"The members of our group will do whatever possible to impress our Government with what appears to us to be its manifest duty. To this end, we shall do all we can to fulfill the international obligation, to which our Government is a party, to establish the Jewish national home in Palestine, with full justice to Moslem and Christian in the Holy land.

"ROYAL S. COPELAND,  
"DANIEL O. HASTINGS,  
"WARREN R. AUSTIN."

REPORT BY SENATOR ROYAL S. COPELAND  
ARTICLE 1

We arrived in Palestine at the height of the reign of terror which had been sweeping the land for 4 months. Even before we stepped off the boat at Haifa we were made aware of the fear which filled every heart.

The country was an armed camp. A state of warfare prevailed, without the martial law warranted by the activities of the Arab terrorists.

Yet we were amazed at the sight of Haifa. Here was a beautiful harbor created by Jewish endeavor and sacrifice where but a decade ago no port facilities existed. The harbor presented a busy appearance.

Freight was moving. A cargo of immigrants, Jewish refugees from Russia, was being disembarked in the land of promise.

But there were also some British warships at anchor ready for instant action. These warships were part of the armed forces which Great Britain had been assembling in Palestine ever since the outbreak of the Arab strike and campaign of assassination.

It was a sight typical of all Europe today, where civilization is being eclipsed by the shadows of guns and marching armies.

Haifa did not look at all like Asia. It impressed me as a miniature Naples, a beautiful modern city which dotted the slopes of Mount Carmel down to the blue waters of the sea. It was as if the frontiers of Europe had been shoved eastward by a magic hand.

Modern buildings, hotels and cafes, schools and hospitals, theaters and shops, all bore witness to the peaceful conquest of the Near East by a host of Jewish pioneers and builders from the West.

We were welcomed upon our arrival by representatives of the American Jewish community in Palestine and by the representative of the Jewish Agency. The latter is recognized under the Mandate by Great Britain as the official body in charge of the restoration of the Jewish National Home in Palestine.

We proceeded with the inquiry, which was the purpose of our visit. Shortly after landing we held a series of conferences with both Jewish and Arab spokesmen in Haifa. Although our stay in the Holy Land was limited, the size of the country made it possible to conduct a pretty thorough investigation in a couple of weeks.

The area of Palestine is about one-fifth larger than that of Massachusetts or New Jersey. The entire population is less than one-fourth of either of these two States. The Holy Land is provided with excellent modern highways which have been built largely by Jewish labor, capital and engineers.

One of the vital questions which concerned us was the absorptive capacity of Palestine.

In view of the burning need for a haven for millions of persecuted Jews in eastern Europe, it was imperative to settle the problem: Can Palestine house a population of several millions?

If Palestine, with an area a little less than that of Belgium, could ever maintain the density of population equal to that of Belgium, it would have room for at least 6,000,000 souls. If Palestine were ever to rival Massachusetts in density of population, it could harbor over 10,000,000 people.

It is obvious that the answer to the absorptive capacity of Palestine lies in the development of industry and commerce. For Palestine is the maritime frontier of a vast hinterland which is just beginning to awaken to the call of civilization.

Haifa supplied us with some hopeful indications that the future of Palestine, as a home for millions of Jews, may be made possible by the development of industry, without minimizing the role of agriculture.

We inspected some industrial establishments in the vicinity of Haifa. It will suffice to cite but one example of the industrial progress of the Zionist movement, the Kremener foundry on the Plain of Zebulun.

But 3 years ago there was nothing but sand where the busy plant is now turning out bathtubs and plumbing fixtures for Palestine and the neighboring countries.

The creator of the foundry was a victim of the Hitler campaign against the Jews. He left Germany, and with small capital launched and built a plant equipped in ultramodern fashion.

He trained his workers, many of whom are German refugees who had never done manual labor. He developed a market which has never been tapped in that part of the world.

As we surveyed the operations of the foundry and conversed with the workers I sensed the great happiness of these begrimed men. There was a pride in their stride and in their faces which said to me:

"At last we are now in our own home. We have been driven from pillar to post long enough. We have come to rebuild our land and our land has already rebuilt us."

#### ARTICLE 2

Between Haifa and Jerusalem lies the major war zone of the present strife in Palestine. The railroad connecting the two cities is periodically cut by Arab night raiders. In spite of patrol engines running ahead of them, trains are derailed. Marauders from the hills shoot at the passing coaches. All night traffic is suspended. Highway travel is even more precarious because of terrorists lying in ambush.

The British Mandatory Government of Palestine was deeply concerned over the safety of our party. We had been formally notified when we entered the harbor of Haifa that we must not travel to Jerusalem except by air and that we must not go about the countryside. Naturally, some of us wondered why the mandatory power, after 4 months of turmoil, was unable to maintain law and order in the land entrusted to its care.

We called on the district commissioner of Haifa, Mr. Keith-Roach, who eventually arranged for our trip to Jerusalem. We proceeded in two stages, by rail to Lydda, and thence by motor to the capital of the country. We had the protection of a special convoy consisting of a detachment of 30 soldiers. The men, armed with rifles and machine guns, were under the command of Captain McAllister of the Cheshire Regiment.

Our baggage preceded us in our two hired cars, driven by Max and David, two Jewish drivers who had come up from Jerusalem through the Arab-infested back country. Max is a deputy constable. A native of Palestine, he went about his business undismayed by the daily toll of murders. Indeed, it was remarkable to watch the fortitude with which the entire Jewish population conducted itself in the face of constant danger.

In the compartment adjoining ours in the railway coach was a detail of soldiers. At both ends of the coach were armed soldiers who alighted at every stop, with their guns ready for action. Ahead of the train was a special patrol car, a converted open Ford truck on railway wheels. The sides of the truck consisted of half-inch armor plate. This "lookout trolley," as the Tommies in Palestine call it, ran ahead of the train at a distance of a couple of miles. It carried five soldiers and a machine gun.

It was perhaps an unusual experience for three United States Senators, accompanied by their wives, to find themselves traveling under conditions which resembled those of a battle front in wartime. We passed Athlit, on the Mediterranean, where Richard the Lion Hearted landed with his crusaders. It was not difficult to imagine what his feelings were in the long ago.

The train proceeded through a zone dotted with flourishing Jewish colonies. Citrus groves enriched the landscape. It was a scene to gladden the eye.

But all along the way were dugouts in which soldiers nestled behind sandbags. Now and then we passed encampments. Bayonets gleamed in the sun. Raw youths just from England and veteran soldiers of Allenby's triumphant army were sharing alike the hardships and hazards of guerilla warfare under a civilian administration.

The train slowed up. We could see the fresh embankment over which we were passing. Laborers were at work repairing the roadway. Here a train had been derailed a few days earlier, resulting in many casualties. A favorite trick of the marauders is to creep up in the night and loosen the rails by removing the bolts. It is one of the purposes of the "lookout trolley" to test the roadbed and to watch for loose rails, running at a speed of about 40 miles an hour.

We were approaching Hedera. The stretch beyond, as far as Tul-Karm, was exceptionally dangerous. Although it was forenoon, Captain McAllister warned us that the train might be fired upon. In that event, he said, it would be safest for the party to leave the compartment and stay in the passageway of the coach, on the side away from the hills. Fortunately there was no shooting that day.

Some of the soldiers were bitter and outspoken in their remarks. One officer had lost four of his men in an engagement with an Arab band. He was a veteran who had marched into Jerusalem under the banner of Allenby's victorious army.

Another officer with whom we talked on that trip said:

"This was a wasteland when I first saw Palestine. The Jews simply transformed the country. For centuries the Arabs did nothing. The Jews took the desolate land and turned it into gardens and groves. They built villages and cities where no man thought it could be done. The Arabs sold the land for big money. Now they want to keep the money and they also want the land back."

It was clear that many British soldiers chafed at the leniency with which the Arab terrorists were being treated. They are pinning for a Kitchener or an Allenby. About twoscore British soldiers have already been killed during the latest disturbances. Yet in the absence of martial law no soldier was allowed to fire on an Arab, even if the latter was taking aim at him. He was only permitted to shoot when actually fired upon.

After 3 hours of travel by train, we alighted at Lydda, where we were met by the American consul from Jerusalem. Seated in three cars, each of which carried an escort of soldiers, and followed by a special car containing a machine-gun crew, we started on a wild dash to Jerusalem. The winding road traversed the hills of Judea. In the recesses of those barren hills lay hidden the main bands of the Arab terrorists.

We were approaching the City of Peace, but the atmosphere was that of war. We received the news of the latest outrages in the land, and we asked ourselves:

"Has Great Britain not the power to make human life safe in the Holy Land entrusted to her care by the nations of the world?"

#### ARTICLE 3

"Will the British Government take stern measures to suppress the guerrilla bands or will it yield to the terrorists by making concessions to the Arab high committee?"

This was the overshadowing question when we arrived in Jerusalem on August 25. The 400,000 Jews of Palestine were in a state of despair, in the belief that the mandatory power was about to nullify certain vital provisions of the mandate as the price of a temporary peace.

It should be noted here that the restraint of the Jewish population, which includes at least 50,000 World War veterans from all countries, has been truly remarkable in the face of the prolonged Arab campaign of assassination and arson. This was later confirmed by the British High Commissioner, Sir Arthur G. Wauchope.

The arrival of the Hearst unofficial senatorial delegation, in these circumstances, assumed an historic character. The entire Jewish population welcomed our coming as a godsend.

Was our presence in Palestine at that critical moment welcome to the British authorities? If so, they did not go out of the way to demonstrate it. It is true, we referred publicly upon our arrival in the Holy Land to the standing invitation issued by Lord Balfour to Secretary of State Hughes in January 1922, in which the United States was asked to do whatever possible "to lighten the load" assumed by Great Britain under the mandate. But it was clear that the British did not like being reminded of that document and of America's recognized interest in the administration of the mandate.

We were deluged by requests for audiences and conferences from responsible public bodies. The entire press of the country, both Jewish and Arab, as well as the large contingent of foreign correspondents now in Palestine, displayed the deepest interest in our mission. We proceeded with our inquiry without delay and found ourselves in the vortex of conflicting Jewish, Arab, and British claims and counterclaims.

Although Jerusalem resembled in some ways a besieged city, no handicaps were placed in our way. The government had placed at our disposal a special detail of soldiers, but within a day or two we dispensed with their services. It appeared that traveling about the city in the company of an armed soldier offered the greatest temptation to Arab snipers.

All the gates to the city have barbed-wire fences, guarded by armed patrols. The streets and squares are similarly patrolled. The evidences of the Arab strike are everywhere. Arab shops are closed. In the walled

old city, the narrow lanes which are usually crowded to capacity by vendors and shoppers are now deserted. Here both the Jewish and Armenian shops are shut, too. Only bread stores are open.

At 7 o'clock every evening the curfew law descends upon Jerusalem, and all movement is stopped, except by the few who possess special passes. Such passes were provided upon request to members of our party and to such callers who had appointments with us. Not a night passed in Jerusalem during our stay there without shots being echoed among the hills on which the city is built.

Yet it was exhilarating to be in Jerusalem. Probably no city in the world has had so much written about it. But the full story of Jerusalem can perhaps never be written. It has to be experienced.

Coming from torrid southern Italy and Egypt, with reports before us of temperatures ranging as high as 105° back home, Jerusalem late in August proved a haven of delight. Situated at an elevation of 2,700 feet above sea level, the climate of the Holy City was blessed indeed. Even during the hours of brilliant sunshine there was always a balmy breeze. The nights and mornings were invigoratingly cool.

We had worried on our journey as to the hotel accommodations in Jerusalem. How astonished we were when we found ourselves in one of the finest and newest hotels in the world, the King David, which has no peer in the entire Near East and which is not surpassed by any hostelry in the United States.

That hotel alone, erected 6 years ago, is a monument to the miraculous transformation of Palestine in recent years. Jerusalem itself has spread out in all directions, the old city forming the hub of a far-flung and throbbing metropolis in the making; new residential quarters, modern edifices rub elbows with historic relics of stirring antiquity.

But the physical face of Jerusalem is secondary to its soul. Who can capture the mood which hangs over the city at sunrise and at sunset? It is truly unique. That alone can explain the rise within its cradle of the three great religions of the world, of which the mother religion was that of the Hebrews.

And now the descendants of those Hebrews come to redeem the land of their forefathers under a pledge made to them by the nations of the world, were fearful of the repudiation of that pledge by the trustee, Great Britain.

The Jewish settlers in Palestine were hoping that the United States, which ratified that pledge by an act of Congress and which consented to the British trusteeship by a solemn treaty, would, through our delegation, take their case before the supreme court of world public opinion.

#### ARTICLE 4

On the night of August 23, the date of our arrival in Palestine, a quarter of Jerusalem inhabited largely by American citizens of Jewish faith was subjected to a fusillade on three sides. The press and the official bulletins reported nothing about the attack. We did not learn of it until some days after we reached Jerusalem.

The matter was brought to our attention in an appeal for help presented to us by a delegation of the United Brethren of American Jews in Jerusalem, an association comprising about 600 citizens of the United States. From this report it appeared that the atrocities being committed by the Arab terrorists were jeopardizing the lives of thousands of American citizens now settled in Palestine.

The status of these American citizens, it should be noted, differs from that of our citizens in Spain or other foreign zones of trouble. Palestine is under a mandatory government, and is not a colony or a possession of Great Britain. Under the treaty concluded between the United States and Great Britain in 1924, American nationals

are guaranteed protection of their lives and property in Palestine.

The plea made to us by the Jewish American community in Jerusalem is, therefore, a document of vital concern to the Government and to the people of the United States. At the same time it recites facts which cannot be ignored by our Department of State.

"We left America not as a result of persecution and hatred," reads the petition presented to us by six representatives of the United Brethren of American Jews in Jerusalem.

It continues:

"We were animated by the high ideal of the restoration of our ancestral holy country, of the revival of our people, of the realization of the vision of our prophets: 'From Zion goes forth the Law.'

"The American Jews invested millions of dollars in Palestine. They founded new settlements. They erected hospitals and clinics. They built health centers. And their share in the foundation and development of the Hebrew University is a prominent one.

"But all these achievements are for the moment menaced by destruction. Wild bands are uprooting our groves, burning down our buildings, ambushing our men and our women, and not sparing even children. There is no security on public roads, no security for life and property.

"We came to Palestine relying on the solemn declaration of Great Britain, supported by 25 other governments. We put our trust especially in the treaty signed between Great Britain and the United States of America. But we had to experience that the mandatory power is far from keeping its solemn pledge.

"Transjordanian was separated from Palestine. Government land was granted to Arabs only. Jewish immigration was limited and the acquisition of land was made difficult.

"And what has been going on during the last 5 months is beyond any imagination. The Jews are almost outlawed. And not only are they not given sufficient protection, but they are also hindered in the elementary right of self-defense. The police and authorities investigate with no results. The courts do not punish adequately. And the Arab bandits are treated like an enemy's army.

"We desire to give here but one concrete example of the dangerous position to which the majority of us here have had the unfortunate experience of being eyewitnesses. On Sunday night, August 23, between 10 and 11, our quarter, known as Kerem Abraham, was violently attacked by shooting from three sides. The firing came from very close range and we heard the bullets strike the stone walls.

"We woke the children and together we got down on the floors for safety. There was no help from police or soldiers. In the morning, boys picked up bullets on the streets. On one shutter, there were more than 20 bullet marks. One missile pierced the iron grating and entered the home.

"Panic-stricken we went to the American consul, who gives us his valuable aid at all times. We fear, however, that the chaotic conditions here are fast reaching the point beyond the aid of the consulate.

"In danger and distress we appeal to you, honorable representatives of our great and beloved country and of the noblest traditions of human rights, asking you to bring our lament before the people and the Government of the United States, and to cause friendly intervention in our favor."

The petition was signed by Rabbi S. Winograd, Rabbi S. Bernstein, Rabbi H. Koufman, Sisman Shafer, I. W. Wolf, and Harry Leyton.

It was the prayer of these delegates, as expressed to me, that Washington would take note of their plight and that of the other Americans in Palestine whose rights and lives were in constant peril.

#### ARTICLE 5

Do the British police authorities actually play into the hands of the Arab terrorists? Are means of defense denied and proper protection refused to the terrorized colonies, thus inviting invasion by bands of vandals? Are the lives and property of American nationals safeguarded by the mandatory government, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain?

The case of the American citizen, Savel Kwartin, whose orange grove was ravaged during our stay in Palestine, presents a striking answer to the foregoing questions. It is a case typical of the havoc being wrought in the Holy Land under a lax administration.

Several days after our arrival in Jerusalem, we received the following telegram from Tel Aviv:

"THE AMERICAN SENATORS COPELAND, HASTINGS, AUSTIN.

*King David Hotel, Jerusalem.*

"Kindly grant interview at your stay in Tel Aviv. I wish to present precarious condition of American residents and their property here. The day before yesterday approximately four thousand trees were uprooted in my grove. Local authorities have refused all adequate protection.

"SAVEL ZEBULON KWARTIN."

An investigation upon our arrival in Tel Aviv disclosed to me the following facts, which should be of interest to our Department of State:

On the night of August 26, a band of 50 Arabs, armed with guns, invaded Mr. Kwartin's orange grove, 3 miles from the Jewish settlement of Hedera. The vandals held up the three watchmen, and within a few hours uprooted approximately 4,000 trees, valued at about \$16,000, without counting the loss of income to the proprietor involved in the destruction.

Now 2 months earlier the same grove had been similarly invaded and several hundred trees then uprooted. Mr. Kwartin had applied to the district police office at Rehovoth for permission to keep on the property a number of armed constables. His request was flatly refused. He was permitted to supply his laborers temporarily with two shot-guns.

Toward the end of July, a police patrol searched the grove and found one shotgun and one old Turkish rifle in the possession of the chief watchman, who had apparently failed to renew his license. The arms were seized, the watchman and his two helpers were arrested. The grove was left without any protection, at the very time when the owner was frantically trying to secure from the higher authorities a special police guard.

Three days before the destruction of the orange grove, on August 23, Mr. Kwartin went to the deputy district superintendent of police and to the assistant district commissioner of Gaza to plead that at least four special constables be placed on his plantation. The situation in the country was tense. The answer he received was:

"The matter is receiving attention."

Following the devastation of the grove on the night of August 26, the desperate Mr. Kwartin requested of the authorities in Gaza that a British officer be entrusted with the investigation of the act of vandalism. Instead, an Arab officer was assigned to the case. When we were in Tel Aviv, the culprits had not yet been discovered.

A week after the invasion, on August 31, Mr. Kwartin received from police headquarters in Jaffa a notice that his application for armed constables had been refused.

Scores of thousands of trees, planted with love and sacrifice, have been destroyed in the Holy Land in recent months. Homesteads, barns, livestock have been destroyed by fire. Factories have been burned to the ground. Much of the damage suffered was sustained by American citizens.

There is considerable evidence available that the indifference of the local authorities is responsible for the continuation of the reign of terror. It is, indeed, a mockery that while the British Army in Palestine is striving to extinguish the blaze of arson and assassination, many of the civilian officers are either wittingly or unwittingly encouraging the spread of that blaze.

Mr. Kwartin, a cantor of international repute, moved to Palestine under twofold assurances. As a Jew, he went there to participate in the rebuilding of the Jewish national home guaranteed by Great Britain and all the nations of the world, including the United States. As an American citizen, he went there with the knowledge and belief that the solemn treaty existing between the British Government and the United States was intended to protect American nationals and interests.

In the course of our investigation we received many complaints from injured settlers in Palestine, indicating that the terror is not due to the inability, but to the unwillingness, of the British to cope with it effectively.

In Palestine, as elsewhere, a policy of yielding to violence begets more violence. As our inquiry progressed it became clearer that both Jews and Arabs who were bent on pursuing their peaceful labors were suffering from the malfeasance of the mandatory administration of the country.

#### ARTICLE 6

Next to the great sanitation work carried out in Panama by American genius there has been no greater achievement in the field of public health anywhere in the world than the sanitation program put into effect in Palestine by American Jews.

Into a land infested with malaria, reeking with disease, peopled by backward and superstitious races, the Zionist pioneers brought the most modern methods of preserving human life and health. The best that we have in America has been transplanted and successfully established in the Holy Land.

At a moment when Arab terrorists were assassinating Jewish nurses and planning bombing in Jewish playgrounds it was inspiring to visit the Nathan Straus Health Centers and Hadassah Hospitals where the work of mercy was being carried on in the interests of both Jews and Arabs.

Even the shocking murder of the two young Jewish nurses at Jaffa, a few days before our arrival in Palestine, served to emphasize the Jewish contribution to the welfare of the Arab people. For the two sisters of mercy were killed while reporting to work at a hospital filled mostly with patients belonging to the race of their murderers.

The inscription over the door of the Nathan Straus Health Center in Jerusalem, "For all races and creeds," epitomized to me the broad humanitarian character of the Jewish reconstruction work. Knowing and loving Mr. Straus and having talked with him many times years ago about his plans for Palestine, I rejoiced to see how fully they have been realized.

The death and infant mortality rates in Palestine show a steady and unusual decline during the last decade. The death rate among the Jews fell from 13.45 to 8.57 per thousand from 1927 to 1935. Among non-Jews the corresponding reduction was from 31.4 to 22.3. During the same period the infant mortality rate dropped from 115.3 to 64 among Jews and from 213.4 to 146 among non-Jews.

Who would have thought a decade ago that the infant mortality rate in Palestine would be among the lowest in the world and approximate that of the healthiest cities in the United States? In the adjacent Arab countries that rate is nearly twice as high as in the Holy Land.

Where in the Near East, and, in fact, all of Asia, is there to be found a public-health

budget per head of the population comparable with that of Palestine? Although the Jews contribute the major part of the Government's revenue, the Palestine health budget is devoted mainly to the needs of the Arabs. The Jewish Health Service is almost self-supporting.

The total health expenditure in Palestine is over three times as high as that of the highest of the neighboring countries.

More than \$2,000,000 have been expended by Jewish public funds on drainage works, resulting in an amazing reduction in malaria cases. The superior efforts at the improvement of health conditions in Palestine are further illustrated by the fact the Holy Land imports per head of population five times as much medicine as Egypt and three and one-half times as much as Syria.

Take such an American commonplace as the pasteurization of milk. When our party reached Egypt on the way to Palestine, we were warned not to drink milk or consume any dairy products. For days we touched no butter. Pasteurized milk is almost unknown in the Near East.

But in the Nathan Straus Health Center in Jerusalem I found a modern pasteurization plant, installed by the Hadassah organization some years ago. And the children in the various clinics bore witness to the value of fine milk and other modern facilities and care given them.

This health center and that of Tel Aviv, which I inspected, are model institutions, equipped with experimental kitchens, dental clinics, nurseries, prenatal and postnatal dispensaries, visiting nurse services, and excellent medical staffs.

As a former health commissioner of the city of New York I could not fail to recognize the monumental progress in the preservation of human life made in Palestine by the Jewish settlers, aided by their coreligionists throughout the world.

As a United States Senator conducting an inquiry into the general status of the Jewish National Home under the mandate, I could not but feel outraged over the wanton destruction of innocent children's lives in the country, due to a lax government.

When I returned from my inspection of the health center in Jerusalem, where the tots romped about me so gaily, I found a copy of a letter addressed to the high commissioner waiting for me. It had been penned by the bereaved grandmother of three little children who, together with their father, were murdered in their beds on the night of August 13 by Arab rebels. The letter read:

"Self-assured and with a fearful calm, the murderers stood shooting their bullets one by one into the hearts of the children.

"\* \* \* After they had shot their bullets at two of the children, whose souls departed at once, I threw a sheet over the third child and sat upon it to protect him, but the murderer flung me off the sheet, wounded me and shot the death-dealing bullets at my third grandchild before my eyes and the eyes of the unhappy mother, who never ceased entreating the murderers to leave her at least one child alive. \* \* \*

"Were they not killed because the representatives of the government in the town did not provide any guard for their lives? Yes. They fell as sacrifices to the dreadful mistakes of your government representatives. And from whom can I demand the blood of these sacrifices?

"Your Excellency, you have, to be sure, seen more than enough bloodshed in your life. But have you also seen the blood of children on their cots? Have you also seen the blood of a babe gushing across its mother's knees?"

#### ARTICLE 7

With sandbags lining the observation roof of the Hebrew University and barbed-wire gates barring the road to Mount Scopus, on which it is situated, the condition confronting that astonishing center of learning in

Jerusalem brought home to us as nothing else in Palestine did, the great tragedy of the people of the Book.

If there be a modern prophet in Israel, Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the chancellor of the Hebrew University, a native of the United States, comes nearest in my opinion to that stature. A firm believer in peace between the Jews and the Arabs, he continues to reside in an Arab quarter of the city in spite of imminent peril to his family.

I have seen many universities in Europe and in the United States in my lifetime. But the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which is only 10 years old, impressed us all as an incomparable achievement.

It was thrilling to go through the University Museum of Biblical Botany, where the plants mentioned in the Bible are on exhibition. It was fascinating to stand in the Untermyer Open Air Theater on the university grounds and behold the magnificent panorama stretching as far as the Dead Sea and the Jordan.

It was impressive to walk through the fireproof stalls of the university library containing more than 300,000 volumes, the largest collection in the Near and Middle East.

The departments of the university cover a vast range of subjects, from the Bible to chemistry, from archaeology to physics, from Arabic history to cancer research. All of the courses are conducted in the Hebrew of the Bible, which has become once more a living tongue in Palestine.

Despite the terror in the country, plans were being completed while we were in Jerusalem for the laying of the cornerstone of the medical center of the university. The Jewish Physicians' Committee of the United States, in cooperation with Hadassah, has been mainly instrumental in creating the building fund for the new institution.

The medical and the lay public will be surprised to learn, as I was, that Jerusalem harbors one of the finest cancer research institutes in the world. It is now housed in the Nathan Straus Health Center, but is part of the university, and will be transferred to the medical center when it is constructed.

It was my good fortune, as a medical man, to meet Professor Halberstaedter, one of Europe's greatest cancer radiologists, now a refugee from Germany. We were joined by Prof. B. Zondek, numbered among the world's leading gynaecologists. Both of these renowned medical authorities are associated with the university.

Many other leading physicians from central Europe have migrated to Palestine. It is no exaggeration to say that their presence would grace the leading medical schools in the United States.

Palestine bids fair to become a universal center of education, if the Jewish national home is allowed to develop unhindered. In Haifa our party visited the Hebrew Institute of Technology, founded through the munificence of the late Jacob Schiff, of New York. The shops and the laboratories of the institution testified to the ability of Jewish youth to master the applied sciences.

New building materials which were being tested there showed how the Jews are making use of the advance in modern science in the reconstruction of the Holy Land.

In Tel Aviv I had occasion to inspect the Balfour High School, as modern a school of its kind as is to be found anywhere in America. The enthusiasm of the teachers was most revealing. Incidentally, this newest city in the world boasts of a 100-percent school attendance. The entire elementary school system of Tel Aviv is maintained almost entirely at the expense of the Jewish municipality.

The mandatory government is entrusted with the maintenance of the educational system in Palestine. Actually it supports almost entirely the Arab schools, but grants about 14 percent of the budget of the Jewish public

school system. The Jewish National Council stressed this point to us as evidence of discrimination against the Jews and of the benefits accruing to the Arabs from revenue largely derived from the Jewish population.

The total public-school expenditure in Palestine, on a per capita basis, is four times as great as that in the adjacent Transjordan, and nearly three times as great as that of Iraq, the latter two countries being almost exclusively Arabic.

In Palestine, 1 out of every 11 of the population is a school child. Across the Jordan, where no Jews are to be found, 1 out of every 27 is provided with schooling facilities.

As our survey progressed it became ever clearer to us that the Jews brought to Palestine an improvement in social welfare which is still undreamed of in the neighboring Arab countries. They poured into the desolate Holy Land their boundless energy, large streams of capital, and scientific abilities. Within 15 years the Zionist pioneers raised the standard of living of the entire population to a level which stands out high above that the Asiatic environment.

Yet the peaceful march of civilization in Palestine was being challenged before our very eyes by certain violent agitators among the Arabs, who demanded the stoppage of Jewish immigration. The reign of terror in the land plainly showed that economic blessings do not spell political peace. In Palestine, as elsewhere, a virus is at work which was designed to destroy the best gains of civilization.

#### ARTICLE 8

There are really two strikes going on in Palestine. One is conducted by Arab terrorists who throw bombs and snipe at passers-by in the streets and on the highways. The other is conducted silently by the Mandatory Government of Palestine against the proper administration of justice.

The prolongation of the terror in the Holy Land is due, in a large measure, to a manifest sympathy for the vandals and assassins displayed by many officials who are sworn to uphold the law.

It is an inconceivable but indisputable fact, too, that not a single capital conviction was handed down by the courts of the country during the first 4 months of the terrorist campaign.

Yet during that period hundreds were killed, other hundreds were wounded in many bloody attacks, including dozens of British soldiers, and scores of terrorists were seized while perpetrating their crimes.

During our stay in Jerusalem the press of Palestine, and even that of England, furnished ample evidence of this unique state of affairs, creating a condition which could not but shock any American observer. At the height of the terror 25 interned Arabs were released from the concentration camp. Cases against terrorists were dismissed by judges on flimsy technicalities. There was daily proof, if not of official encouragement, at least, of no apparent discouragement to the murderers and lawbreakers.

What an astonishing situation. Here was a government solemnly pledged to the establishment of a Jewish national home. Here was an open and ugly rebellion conducted by the foul means of assassination, which spared not women and children. And here was the most vital branch of the Government apparently flagrantly obstructing the machinery of justice.

The Palestine judiciary is part of the civil service of the mandatory government which is nothing but a trustee for the Jewish national home.

An investigation disclosed that about 50 percent of the total number of judges of the supreme court are Arabs and about 75 percent of all district officers in the country are Arabs.

In addition, a considerable number of English judges and court officials sworn to carry

out the provisions of the mandate could not disguise their opposition to the mandate and their prejudices in favor of the rebels.

Three days before our arrival in Palestine, an Arab terrorist, Ahmad Mustafa, was arrested by the military during an engagement with a large Arab band. At that moment there was a widespread outbreak of violence in various parts of the country.

The case came up on August 31 before Judge Sherwell, the president of the district court of Haifa. The prisoner was charged with possessing ammunition when caught. Lance Corporals Tetlow and Atkinson gave evidence.

The prosecutor was Ibrahim Bitar. Judge Sherwell acquitted the prisoner and censured the prosecution for failing to present the prisoner 4 days earlier.

A similar striking example occurred in Jerusalem when another judge dismissed the case of an Arab terrorist charged with murder, because the chief witness, a British Army officer, had been temporarily called out of the country in the performance of his duty. Instead of continuing the case, the court set the prisoner free.

On August 26, the Palestine Court of Appeal reduced a number of sentences passed upon Arabs caught at the scenes of their crimes.

One Abdullah Ghazawi, who had been sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment for setting fire to crops in Herzlia, was given a new sentence of 1 to 3 years.

Another convict, Yusef Yacoub, sentenced to 5 years' hard labor for being in possession of a pistol, had his sentence quashed by the court of appeals.

There are innumerable cases on record which serve to create the impression that many of the Palestine judges and magistrates are coddling the terrorists, thereby encouraging murder, and palpably violating their oaths of office.

Many such cases have been cited in petitions and memoranda submitted to the High Commissioner by responsible bodies without any seeming effect.

On the other hand the judiciary shows no leniency in its treatment of Jewish prisoners, despite the fact that the Jews are under attack in their own national home. That they have displayed exemplary self-restraint under extraordinary provocation, was volunteered to me by the High Commissioner himself.

There was the case of two young Jewish watchmen in Jerusalem who were sentenced to 6 and 7 years' hard labor respectively for carrying arms. These watchmen, it was not denied by the prosecution, were defending property in the section where shooting was common.

This was not an isolated case. The records show numerous instances of Jews receiving heavy sentences when arrested in the course of resisting Arab attacks, and under circumstances where no police or military protection was available.

While we were in the country two Arabs who had been seized in the act of attacking soldiers were brought to trial. The court acquitted the bandits of the capital charge of shooting at the soldiers on the technicality of the delay in preparing the case, and sentenced them to 7 years' imprisonment for possessing rifles.

The plain fact is that the British judiciary is sabotaging the British military in Palestine in spite of the state of warfare.

"It is hardly fair to the soldiers who risk their lives to let them think that those who shoot at them, if caught, may escape with 7 years' imprisonment," observed the Palestine Review of August 28 regarding this astonishing decision. Similar comments were heard by us.

How can the terror be stamped out in Palestine when the civil service in effect stimulates civil disobedience? How can the mandatory trusteeship for Palestine be fulfilled

when many of the trustees are unfaithful to their trust?

How can the lives of 12,000 American nationals of Jewish faith in the Holy Land be safeguarded under our treaty with Great Britain when the Palestine judiciary treat the mandate as a scrap of paper and abuse justice in a manner which cries to heaven?

#### ARTICLE 9

If you would behold a living monument to individual initiative and the eternal pioneering spirit in man, in these days of collectivist regimentation, go to Tel Aviv, the magic city on the blue Mediterranean in Palestine.

Without any 5-year plans, without the drive of dictatorship, there has arisen on the sands of the desert this modern city, the only new city built in the world since the great war.

The story of Tel Aviv is the story of modern Palestine. The first entirely Jewish city of our times, with a population of nearly 150,000, Tel Aviv throbs with the energy and zeal of a wandering people at last come into its own.

When our party left Jerusalem to drive to Tel Aviv, escorted by the usual machine-gun crew, there was still fresh in our minds the protest of certain Arab leaders against Jewish immigration into Palestine on the ground that the Jewish settlers were displacing the Arabs.

When at the end of our drive through the barren hillsides there came suddenly into view the city of Tel Aviv, it furnished a striking and irrefutable answer to the Arab claim. But two decades ago a desolate stretch of desert covered the area of the city which now harbors almost 40 percent of the entire Jewish population in the Holy Land.

Tel Aviv is no mushroom town. Its 355 streets, its boulevards and theaters, its shops and cafes, its factories and schools, its superb beach, modern hotels, playgrounds, and massive residential quarters, fully justify Sir Herbert Samuel's description of it as "Palestine's city of miracles."

Perhaps it would be even more fitting to describe Tel Aviv as the city of the healthy children. All of us were equally impressed by the extraordinary physical appearance of the children of Tel Aviv. It was clear that they owe their vigor not only to an outdoor life in continuous sunshine, but also to the emphasis on child welfare underlying the policy of the Jewish national home.

Tel Aviv is a melting pot of Jewish immigrants from over 50 different countries. Here sturdy refugees from Salonika and Yemen rub elbows with their coreligionists who were compelled to flee from Russia and Germany. More than 15,000 refugees from the latter country settled in Tel Aviv in the last 2 years.

The industrialization of Palestine is reflected most in this modern city which houses about 1,600 industrial plants, giving employment to about 30,000 workers. The manufactures include textiles, electrical appliances, building materials, chemical products, and even artificial teeth in the first establishment of its kind in the Near East.

We visited this plant which supplies false teeth as far east as Siam and as far west as London. It was a revelation of the industrial possibilities of the Holy Land in relation to the markets at its disposal. Many of the Tel Aviv factories are running even now on two shifts, turning out products for export to the neighboring countries.

A vital factor in making Palestine a center of international trade is the Levant Fair, the grounds of which we inspected at Tel Aviv. Here several foreign nations have permanent exhibition buildings. This fair promises to do for Palestine what Leipzig does for Germany and what Nizhni-Novgorod used to do for Russia once—to serve as a mart for far-flung traders.

Yet, even in Tel Aviv, which is the safest place in Palestine today, the specter of the terror was felt. In one of the buildings of the Levant Fair we saw a large company of Jewish youths enrolled as special constables undergoing military drill. The city is rigidly policed by regulars and volunteers along its boundaries. Within Tel Aviv there is now but a handful of police, yet crime is almost unknown.

In spite of the guards in the environs Arab terrorists occasionally slip through in the night. A time bomb was planted in this manner in the sand of a playground, and only by its accidental discovery was a tragedy of major dimensions averted.

The municipal authorities of Tel Aviv, led by Acting Mayor Rokach and by the president of the American Jewish Association, Nathan D. Kaplan, formerly of Chicago, met us upon our arrival at the city gate. There was a grand reception in our honor at the town hall, where a huge American flag was on display.

Later we met the notables of Tel Aviv and the representatives of the American Jewish colonies who came from their farms especially to greet us. In addition to the valuable information furnished to us, we felt during our stay the pulse of invincible youth in the ancient Hebrew people and the undying spirit of a reborn race of pioneers in a decaying old world.

#### ARTICLE 10

At the very heart of the Palestine knot is the problem of immigration.

The execution of the mandate entrusted to Great Britain is organically connected with it. The Arab "strike" is based mainly on that capital issue. The development of the country is entirely dependent upon immigration. The solution of the Jewish tragedy in central and eastern Europe is largely related to the absorptive capacity of Palestine.

As a member of the Committee on Immigration of the United States Senate who has wrestled for years with this problem, I was especially interested in its various phases. Many thousands of relatives of naturalized American citizens have in recent years found their only available refuge in Palestine.

In 1935 alone, 62,000 Jewish immigrants were admitted into the Holy Land, a number which equals the annual influx into the United States in the prewar years when immigration was unrestricted. How was a country as small as Palestine able to absorb them, and how did they affect the economic and political conditions in their new home?

A study of the records even on the way to Palestine revealed a number of authoritative reports, compiled by British officials as well as certain Jewish and Arab experts as recently as 8 years ago, which conclusively proved that Palestine was economically unfit to absorb any appreciable stream of immigrants.

The reality belied these authorities. In the last 4 years alone the Jewish population of Palestine was doubled. The total population of the country increased from 757,000 in 1922 to 1,315,000 in 1935, a rise of two-thirds. During the corresponding period the population of Egypt increased only 13 percent.

Yet, we found no unemployment in Palestine. The incoming settlers are absorbed by the thriving industries as rapidly as they land. Tel Aviv took in more than half of all the Jewish immigrants during the 4-year period. Haifa increased its Jewish population by 34,000 since 1931. Jerusalem added some 16,000 new residents in the same period.

What has been the effect of this Jewish immigration upon the Arab population? Did it provide a justifiable cause for the political agitators and terrorists among the Arabs?

The Moslem population showed its greatest growths precisely in those centers where the Jewish immigration was largest. The striking feature was disclosed by an inquiry into

official statistics. The Arab community in Haifa increased by 117 percent since 1922. In Jerusalem, the corresponding growth was 47 percent. In Jaffa, which adjoins Tel Aviv, the increase in the Arab community was 69 percent.

On the other hand, the Arab towns far removed from the zones of Jewish development show for the same period but an insignificant growth, such as 12 percent for Jenin, 8 percent for Nablius, and an actual decrease for Gaza.

Has Jewish immigration been the cause of Arab emigration? Before the war, the Arabs were migrating from Palestine by the thousands. Since the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home, the Arabs in neighboring Syria, under a French mandate, have been emigrating at the rate of 9,500 annually.

Over 100,000 Arabs from the surrounding countries entered Palestine as immigrants since the beginning of the Jewish development of the country. This striking fact is but part of the tale of the new Palestine. For even more remarkable has been the total increase of the non-Jewish population of the country since 1922. It shows a growth of nearly 40 percent in 14 years. It is a growth which surpasses by nearly 12 percent that of the rapidly increasing population of Japan during the same period.

What a commentary on the prosperity brought to Palestine by the Jewish pioneers. But what accounts for this tremendous rise in the Arab community? Surely not a sudden expansion of the birth rate. Our survey showed that the main cause of the population rise was due to a decrease in the Arab death and infant mortality rates and to a raised standard of living.

Both the Arab and the Jewish populations retain their rural and urban ratios of distribution. In spite of the great tide of immigration, about three-quarters of all the Jews in the country settled in cities and one-quarter remained on the land. The claim of some Arabs that the Jews were acquiring their land is disproved by Government figures showing that the proportion of Moslems engaged in agriculture in relation to their urban population has remained constant.

Today the Jews of Palestine number about 30 percent of the total population. By their performance they have demonstrated that there is room in Palestine, including Transjordan, for millions more of their persecuted brethren if the British Government carries out the terms of the mandate for the facilitation of Jewish immigration.

#### ARTICLE 11

In the recurrent bloody strife between the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine, the agents of Moscow have been quick to exploit the opportunities for their own ends. In the present reign of terror, according to information we gleaned in Jerusalem, the Communists early joined the campaign by inciting the Arabs against the Jewish settlers.

In my candid opinion, there is no more solid anti-Communist body in the world than the 400,000 Jewish people in the Holy Land. Many of them hail from Russia where Zionism is persecuted and the Hebrew tongue outlawed. One of our chauffeurs was a Jewish youth typical of this class of immigrants. He had been exiled to Siberia for his Zionist beliefs. His mother arrived in Palestine on the day our party landed in Haifa. She had buried her husband in Siberian exile and was ransomed from Soviet captivity by her son.

The powerful Palestine Federation of Labor, which numbers nearly 100,000 members, and which represent virtually all the Jewish workers in the country, has a standing rule which automatically bars any Communist from joining a labor union.

We were reliably informed that the Jewish section of the Communist Party in Palestine numbered less than 200 persons. It was difficult to ascertain the extent of the Arab Communist movement.

The recent policy of Moscow has been to align the Communist with the Arab nationalists, under the disguise of a united front, and to identify the Zionist leadership with British imperialism. The latter has been done despite the obvious cleavage between the responsible Jewish leaders and the British authorities.

The policy of the Jewish community in Palestine, in the face of Communist proclamations encouraging massacre, has been to deliver known Communists to the authorities for deportation. A group of such deportees was being taken in a prison car to the Haifa port in the same train which carried us there on the way out of Palestine.

The Palestine Review, leading Jewish weekly of the country, commented:

"It is impossible to give as yet a complete account of the atrocious part played by the Communists, Jewish as well as Arab, in the present riots. The facts so far known suffice to make it amply clear that they have been even more active than in 1929.

"Never were the Jews of Palestine so deeply revolted as now by these activities . . . and never were they as determined to rid Palestine of the Jewish section at least of its Communist Party."

In the course of our investigation of this phase of the terror, we received from a high official source the text of a Communist proclamation, issued in Haifa this August, written in English, and addressed:

"To all British soldiers, members of the navy and the air forces in Palestine and Transjordan."

This remarkable document described the terrorist strike as "the struggle of the working masses in Palestine for liberation."

It took up the agitation for an "Independent Arab federation" of all Arab countries. It proceeded to fan Arab nationalism by representing Palestine as "an organic part of Syria," torn away by imperialistic Great Britain and turned over to the latter's "partner"—Zionism.

"And what is the purpose of this partnership?" read the text of the appeal, giving answer as follows:

"An eternal subjugation, cruel suppression, limitless exploitation of all inhabitants of the country. And all this for what purpose? For the creation of a Zionist state, which will serve as a secure point of support in order to get out the highest possible profits for the British-Zionist capital!

"The Arabs will become a minority in their own country, and on the ruins of their cities and villages shall be built by the Zionists . . . under the protection of the British bayonets, a new dominion, a national home for the international capital.

"Limitless suffering has been caused to the working masses by the Zionists, who are evicting them from their lands and robbing them of their places of work, and by the British imperialists who are sucking out the country's sap and are shedding the blood of its inhabitants."

The proclamation then proceeded to call on the British soldiers and marines to join the Arab insurgents. It closed with the following battle-cry:

"Long live the Soviet Government, a government of deputies of workers' and peasants' councils, in a federative republic of all the working people of the Arab countries!

"Long live Soviet England!

"Long live the world social revolution!"

This document indicated to us that Moscow was ready to take over the most bigoted arguments in order to foster civil war. It offered proof that while the Soviet Government was attempting to fraternize with Great Britain in Europe, it wielded the assassin's knife in the East. And it furnished evidence, if any was needed, that the Communist international still adhered as firmly as ever to the cause of world revolution.

## ARTICLE 12

While the Arab High Committee in charge of the strike is officially demanding the prohibition of the sale of land to Jews, some of the prominent Arab leaders active in that committee are quietly trying to sell land to Jewish buyers.

Several such cases were brought to our attention. The most striking of these involved no less a personage than T. A. Husseini, a relative of the Grand Mufti, the religious head of all the Moslems in Palestine, and the dominant figure in the present strike. The Husseini family exercises an almost dynastic influence upon the political and economic life of the Arab population.

The strike in Palestine broke out on April 19, with the avowed purpose of bringing about a stoppage of Jewish immigration and acquisition of land. Twelve days later, at the very height of the Arab movement, T. A. Husseini, of Jerusalem, addressed in his own handwriting a letter to a prospective Jewish customer in Tel Aviv, offering to sell to him four plots of land. A facsimile of the letter is in our possession.

An interesting feature of this attempted transaction is that the intermediary, Mr. Fuad Farah, is one of the Arab leaders of Jaffa, where the strike was particularly violent at the time.

The cry of the Arab strike leaders has been that the Jewish colonies are robbing the Arab fellahin (peasants) of their land. The evidence disclosed by our investigation revealed that the Arab effendis (landowners) are the sellers of large tracts of land to the Jews. Yet these very effendis, who are not compelled to sell their holdings, incite the Arab peasants against Jewish acquisition of land.

Many of the tracts owned by wealthy Arabs have been assembled during the last 15 years from the neediest Arab peasants, at the lowest possible prices, to be disposed of at high profits to Jewish settlers.

It was, however, somewhat of a surprise to discover that the Jews own altogether but 5 percent of the land in Palestine, although they form 30 percent of the population. In view of this fact, the agitation against the sale of land to Jews seemed to us to be purely artificial in origin and political in purpose.

Moreover, an analysis of the official records showed that the Palestine Government has consistently discriminated against the Jews and favored the Arabs in the disposition of state lands.

The mandate for Palestine contains an unequivocal undertaking, to "encourage . . . close settlement by Jews on the land, including state lands and waste lands not required for public purposes."

Has the mandatory government carried out this provision in good faith? It has not.

The government of Palestine came into the ownership of 945,141 dunams (a dunam is one-quarter of an acre) of state lands. In view of the solemn obligation imposed upon it by the mandate, it is of moment to trace the distribution of this area among the Arabs and the Jews.

Nearly 149,000 dunams, or 15.7 percent of this area, were leased by the government to Arabs. Over 532,000 dunams, or 56.3 percent, have passed out of the hands of the government into Arabic possession. Thus 72 percent of the state lands went to Arabs.

The total of state lands leased or concessioned to Jews amounts to 50,483 dunams, or 5.3 percent. This is what happened under an administration committed to the encouragement of Jewish settlement on the land. The remaining 22.7 percent of this area is either owned by the government or is under litigation.

Now, what happened to the state lands which passed into Arab and Jewish hands? A typical and illuminating case is that of the Hule concession, comprising 57,000 dunams, leased by the government to Selim Bey

Salam of Beyrouth, Syria. One-half of this area was swampland.

The Arab concessionaire immediately entered into negotiations with the Zionist organization for the sale of his lease. The deal was consummated at a price of \$1,000,000. The Jewish holders undertook to spend another \$5,000,000 for the reclamation of the land. Before consenting to the transaction, the government exacted the condition that 15,000 dunams of the improved land be turned over by the Jews to the Arab squatters.

Under the mandate, the Jews had a prior claim to the purchase of the land. Under the original concession, the tract yielded a handsome profit to an Arab from Syria. Under the present arrangement, the Jews are redeeming thousands of acres for Arab cultivators at a cost of \$1,500,000. When the reclamation is completed, the balance of the land left in the hands of the Jews will cost them about \$600 an acre.

One could go on citing other illustrations of large tracts of land turned over to Arabs by the government, on easy terms, which are not being cultivated or developed. They are being held for speculative purposes. Whenever parcels in these areas do pass into the hands of Jewish settlers, the face of the land is immediately changed by the labor and enthusiasm of the Zionist pioneers.

No impartial observer of Palestine today could find any basis for the agitation against the extension of Jewish agriculture, which has set the pace for the rebirth of the Holy Land.

## ARTICLE 13

We met and visited with many of the Arab leaders during our survey of conditions in Palestine. Fairness requires the statement that we found them to be a highly cultured and charming class of people. Among the Christian Arabs there are numerous physicians and lawyers and journalists of ability.

There is a wide chasm dividing the upper sphere of Arabs and the great mass of their race. From the time the Arabs conquered Palestine, 13 centuries ago, there has prevailed what is in effect a feudal system, both economic and social.

Wealth and influence among the Arabs are centralized in a small number of effendi families, the landowners. These are split into parties by deep-seated rivalries and bitter competition for religious as well as political leadership.

In the main, the ruling Arab clans fall into two major camps, one headed by the Husseini family and the other by the Nashashibi family. According to the evidence gathered by us, the British exploited this rivalry in their political maneuvers.

It has been the aim of the mandatory government to prevent the concentration of too much power in one Arab family or group. The policy of dividing the plums was therefore adopted. Amen Husseini was made grand mufti and president of the Supreme Moslem Council. Ragheb Nashashibi was made mayor of Jerusalem. Unfortunately for the British and for the peace of Palestine, this balance of power was upset by the defeat of the mayor in the last municipal election, and a Husseini elected in his stead.

To repair the damage, the High Commissioner advanced the proposal for a legislative council. Although designed to solve peacefully the existing differences between the Jews and the Arabs, the council also represented a scheme to restore the balance of power among the effendi families, the landowners. The defeated mayor was to become the president of the legislative council, according to report.

The High Commissioner was to receive the power to appoint a sufficient number of members to insure proper control.

The Grand Mufti and the Husseinis violently opposed the plan. Jewish leadership also adopted a negative attitude toward it. The British Parliament vetoed the proposed reform, but not before the outbreak of the riots and the attacks on the Jewish settlers.

Temporarily the divided Arab interests joined hands on the issue of the mandate and Jewish colonization. The Grand Mufti sponsored the demand for the stoppage of Jewish immigration and for the prohibition of land sales to Jews. The strike really became an attempt to nullify the mandate and the provision for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

One of the Arab spokesmen in Jerusalem, to whom we are indebted for generous entertainment, even advanced the theory to us that the mandate represents an instrument illegally conceived and executed. He founded this conclusion on certain secret promises allegedly made by British representatives to Arab leaders in the early stages of the World War.

It is a theory which we cannot accept. If any such promises have been made by one or another power, they could not but have been tentative. The war was won by the Allies collectively. No matter what the Arabs elsewhere did, those of Palestine did not contribute to the victory. The mandate was set up by the joint decision of the Allies, with the express consent of the United States. Until it is repealed or modified by some method yet unknown, it must stand as the last word of those who broke the shackles of Turkish bondage.

Great stress was placed by Arab spokesmen, in their conversations with us, upon the claim that many Jews have entered Palestine illegally. Our personal observation convinced us that the numbers smuggled into Palestine must be very small, for the frontier control is remarkably efficient. The official Government report shows that in 1935 there were 7,874 persons remaining in the country illegally. Of this number only slightly more than one-half were Jews.

It must be emphasized that immigration into Palestine is highly regulated on a selective basis. A financial test is imposed upon all admissions. Many are required to possess \$5,000 or more upon entering the country. Skilled artisans must produce a substantial sum of money, while immigrants with a minimum earning capacity are held down to a mere handful.

We found no evidence that immigration into Palestine has been excessive. Yet London by its very passivity encouraged certain elements in Palestine to believe that under political pressure, the mandatory government may actually suspend all immigration for the sake of a truce.

## ARTICLE 14

Palestine is the key to a vast territory, to great oil deposits, to regions of vital value to Great Britain. Its loss by the British Empire might be fatal to its interests in India, in Egypt, and the Suez Canal zone.

Fifteen years ago the British regarded Palestine in a different light. In a letter to Secretary of State Hughes, dated January 13, 1922, the late Lord Balfour wrote:

"The task which the British Government has undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. At Paris I always warmly advocated that it should be undertaken, not by Britain, but by the United States of America, and though subsequent events have shown me that such a policy would never have commended itself to the American people I still think that, so far as the Middle East is concerned, it would have been best."

Lord Balfour was right. It would have been far better for the Middle East and for Palestine to entrust the mandate to America. Of course, it could not have been done because of our traditional attitude of opposition to foreign alliances and entanglements.

But the doubtful gift of 15 years ago has now become a coveted prize, thanks to the astonishing transformation of the land by the Jews. Its value as a maritime frontier, its newly discovered mineral resources, its unforeseen agricultural and industrial potentialities, have been brought to light by the Zionist development.

The international status of Palestine, however, remains unchanged. It is not a British colony or possession. It is held in trust by Great Britain under the mandate. The mandatory is responsible to the League of Nations for its proper administration. It is responsible to the Government of the United States under special treaty, for the execution of the mandate.

Now the Government of Palestine is in power by virtue of the terms of the mandate, which is the supreme law of Palestine. The Government of Palestine must carry out these terms correctly, firmly, and fairly, without prejudice or favor, but it cannot alter the basic law, nor can it formulate policies which violate international undertakings.

"We can return a mandate if we find that we cannot carry it out or if we object to its terms," declared Lloyd George in the House of Commons on June 19, 1936, 2 months after the outbreak of the present terror in Palestine. The war statesman, who was intimately identified with the launching of the mandate, went on to say:

"Then the League of Nations can consider whether they will hand the mandate over to somebody else \* \* \*. But we cannot forget the obligations of the mandate. They are obligations of honor, and, as the Secretary of State has said, we cannot go back upon it \* \* \*. The obligations of the mandate are specific and definite. They are to encourage the establishment of a national home for Jews without detriment to any of the rights of the Arab population \* \* \*. The Arabs are demanding practically that there shall be no more Jewish immigration. We cannot accept that without dishonoring our obligations."

No one can question that it is the duty of the mandatory to guard against the admission of immigrants beyond the capacity of the country to employ them. But to yield on the issue of immigration under the pressure of political agitation and highway terror is another matter.

A pertinent observation on this point is to be found in the blue white paper, published by the New Zionist, in criticism of the official Zionist policy. "That no country can be colonized even to a hair's breadth beyond its economic capacity is a truism," reads the statement. It continues:

"But that capacity can be increased by judicious application of capital on the one hand, and of appropriate economic and social legislation on the other—exactly what is implied in a mandatory Government's obligation to further the development of Jewish colonization.

"Secondly, it is totally wrong to pretend that a country's 'absorptive capacity' is mainly conditioned by its acres, quality of its soil, cubic meters of running water, etc.

"Its 'capacity' depends, above all, on human conditions: First, on the quality of the colonizing element, its skill, endurance, devotion, resourcefulness, financial power, and world connections; secondly, on the action of the state. As to the first condition, the Jews are doing their share; what remains is to bring the state into line."

But how can the state—the British Government—be brought into line with its obligation? Our Government is a party to that obligation, by virtue of a pact with the British Sovereign.

It seems clear to me that our country cannot evade its responsibility under the treaty. We owe it to ourselves to inquire why the great British Empire has failed to make safe the small population of Palestine. It is our

duty to find out why the mandatory power has done nothing to bring together the Arab and Jewish leaders in an effort to promote a lasting peace. It is our right to question the wisdom of bringing into the Palestinian conflict the neighboring Arab chiefs in the capacity of mediators, a policy calculated to fan the blaze and extend the warfare.

REPORT BY SENATOR WARREN R. AUSTIN

#### ARTICLE 1

The grounds for the inquiry conducted by the Hearst unofficial senatorial commission into the crisis in Palestine are rooted in solemn international agreements. Further cause of our inquiry into the serious events now disturbing the Holy Land is the presence there of many American nationals.

Great Britain, to whom was entrusted a mandate for the administration of Palestine which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, is now confronted by demands of the Arab population involving either abrogation of the mandate or modification of it in the following essential obligations:

1. Closing of the doors to Jewish immigration.
2. Prohibition of the sale of land to Jews.
3. The establishment of a national government in Palestine.

These demands have been brought to the attention of the world through the medium of violence and terrorism, accompanying a strike against the mandatory government and the closing down of Arab commercial and industrial establishments.

These demands, being in conflict with the mandate, are of interest to the American people. The Government of the United States became a party to the mandate by virtue of the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924, signed by Frank B. Kellogg, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, and Joseph Austen Chamberlain, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and properly ratified by both governments.

The provisions of this treaty which have an especially important bearing upon America's concern in the situation in Palestine are cited here:

"Whereas the Government of the United States and the Government of His Britannic Majesty desire to reach a definite understanding with respect to the rights of the two Governments and their respective nationals in Palestine. \* \* \* The President of the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty have decided to conclude a convention to this effect. \* \* \*

"Article 1. Subject to the provisions of the present convention, the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above. \* \* \*

"Article 7. Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States."

The express consent given by the United States to the British administration of the mandate for Palestine and the express assent of the United States required in any modification of the mandate, which is fully contained in the treaty, constitute legal sanctions for our inquiry.

Under this treaty, Americans are clearly entitled if not obligated to investigate the lawlessness, civil disobedience, and criminal conduct prevalent in Palestine, and to consider the grievances and demands for abrogation or modification of the mandate which are the objectives of the leaders of the strike and rebellion in the Holy Land.

The United States also has reason to consider the grievance of many Zionists against the divorcement of Trans-Jordan from the original territory of Palestine. The withholding of the benefits of the mandate from

Trans-Jordan and the barring of Jewish immigration from there has been questioned as an unwarranted modification of the mandate.

In an exchange of notes between the parties to the British-American treaty, in August and September 1924, the undertaking was embodied that any changes which may be made in the administration of Trans-Jordan will not be of such a character as to conflict with the terms of the convention.

Moreover, the vigilance of American public opinion with regard to Palestine was expressed by both Houses of Congress in a joint resolution adopted in 1922, which recognized the principle of the historic Balfour Declaration of 1917 in the following words:

"That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christians and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

That is natural and appropriate for Americans to conduct an investigation into the Palestine problem is also evidenced by the standing invitation of Lord Balfour, extended in a letter to Secretary of State Hughes of January 13, 1922, as follows:

"The task which the British Government have undertaken in Palestine is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy. \* \* \* However this may be, the duty has devolved upon Great Britain, and I hope the American Government will do what they can to lighten the load."

Finally, American intellect, capital and labor have poured into Palestine a life-giving stream. Graduates of American agricultural colleges, technologists, experts in irrigation, water production, horticulture, swamp drainage, health service, industrial experimentation, research and education, and rabbis and religious instructors, all of American nationality, with an American base of operation, are actively promoting the redemption of the Holy Land.

These thousands of American nationals, whose ideal is the redemption of the Jewish people, went to Palestine under the guarantees of the mandate and the British-American Convention. Their welfare is legitimate ground for an inquiry into the present state of affairs in Palestine.

#### ARTICLE 2

The Hearst Commission to Palestine first visited Egypt and obtained a basis of comparison between the condition of the Arabs there and that of the Arabs in Palestine.

Palestine is about the same size as Vermont. It is surrounded by Arab countries which form a Moslem crescent whose horns reach the Mediterranean, the western boundary of Palestine. The circumscribed area comprehended in the Balfour Declaration and in the mandate, drafted in 1922, was pinched down in the east as far as the Jordan by an act of the British Government known as the Declaration of Amman of May 25, 1923.

By this act, the benefits of the mandate were withheld from Trans-Jordan and the existence of an independent Arab government, under Emir Abdullah Ibn Hussein, was recognized in the latter territory. The validity of this act has been frequently challenged by many Zionists.

The geographical and ethnological matrix which contains the Palestinian jewel now being cut cannot be carved off or disregarded. The location of the Jewish national home is in an area less than one-hundred-twentieth part of the whole area inhabited by Arabic-speaking peoples.

Vast stretches of desert, however, separate Palestine in the east and in the south from the great Arab centers of population and form natural protection barriers around the Holy Land where the right has been granted to the

Jewish people to establish a national home without prejudicing the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities.

Eighty percent of the blood that was in Palestine on the promulgation of the mandate had been there since long before Moses was put in the bullrushes, we were informed. The peasants were Canaanites. A very small percentage were Bedouins, who constituted the majority in Trans-Jordan. The remainder, save for the Jews, consisted of city dwellers representing a mixture of Arabs, Greeks, Byzantines, Romans, and others. The Jews were small in number relatively but were faithful keepers of the light of Judaism.

It is certain the Arabs of Palestine represent an amalgam; every invasion, Persian, Assyrian, Greek, and Crusader, left a residue in the land. The census of 1931 shows 60 languages and dialects spoken in Palestine.

It is undeniable the spiritual vigor and self-discipline on the part of the Jewish immigrants, and a determination to redeem the prostrate land of their forefathers and to erect a home for their race in the Promised Land, have achieved miraculous transformations there.

Deserts have become forests, swamps have become orchards and vineyards. "Milk and honey" has become again descriptive of that part of the land cultivated by the Jews. Health for Jews and Arabs alike has been promoted by the purification of the water and the amplification of its supply. Drainage, sewerage, and other hygienic works, and especially the health centers and the excellent hospitals and dispensaries operated by the Hadassah, have materially improved the lives of all the inhabitants.

The death and infant mortality rates within the last decade dropped sharply. Educational facilities were widely developed, culminating in excellent universities, both Jewish and Arabic. Palestine boasts the highest per capita school budget in the Near East.

The tendency of wages has been upward for Arabs, as a consequence of Jewish standards. The wage of unskilled Arab workmen in Palestine is twice as much as in Egypt and probably three times as much as it used to be before the coming of the Jews.

The opportunities for Arab employment have greatly increased. There are about 1,500 Arabs employed in Jewish industry and about 8,000 Arabs working in Jewish agricultural settlements. In 1921 there were 80 men employed as laborers in Haifa Harbor. In 1936 about 1,500 Arabs were employed there, thanks to the building of the new port by Jewish enterprise.

The value of land in Palestine has been raised beyond the wildest dreams of two decades ago. With the exception of 5 percent of the land owned by Jews, the Arabs control or possess all of the country. Because the Jewish settlers are eager to acquire land, Palestine represents in the real-estate field a buyers' market. A large stream of capital has in this fashion been poured into Arab coffers.

Notwithstanding the strike, capital and labor of Jews and Arabs have in some instances been working together in peace all along as in the case of the potash plant on the Dead Sea and the cement plant at Haifa.

The political and economic issues involved in the reconstruction of the Holy Land under the mandate compel the attention of American public opinion.

In addition, the monumental example, set by the Jews of Palestine, of obedience to constituted authority and exercise of self-restraint under terrific provocation during the prevailing terrorism justifies a sympathetic interest in the promotion of the national home for the Jews by all friends of humanity and peace.

#### ARTICLE 3

Palestine is probably the only country in the world today where the treasury can boast of a surplus adequate for 2 years of the Government's budget. This surplus has been

accumulated during the last 4 years, when immigration was heaviest and the Government expenditures were on the increase.

This phenomenon is understandable in the light of the finding that about \$450,000,000 of capital has been brought to Palestine by the Jews all over the world, and constructive use made of this huge fund in agriculture and industry and public works and services.

Measured on a per capita basis, each of the 250,000 Jewish immigrants who entered Palestine since the establishment of the mandate carried into the country \$1,800. Of course, a substantial part of this sum represents endowments by coreligionists abroad.

This singular feature of the Jewish colonization of Palestine is emphasized by the fact that more than \$50,000,000 had been invested by Jews at large, through national funds, without any expectation of a commercial return. These funds have been applied to the direct reclamation of the land, with benefits to all the inhabitants.

Palestine has escaped in a remarkable degree the excessive cost of capital which accompanied all colonizing projects. It suffers from no crushing or even moderately heavy interest burden. It has imported large amounts of capital, but its external debt is negligible.

"Other parts of the world have been developed principally by the pioneering labor of persons of little or no wealth, equipped with capital provided by a totally different body of people," observes the Review of the Midland Bank. "The result has been that year by year the developing country has had to provide, out of its own surplus or by fresh borrowings, a growing amount of funds abroad for interest on its external debts.

"In Palestine, by contrast, the settlers have brought with them the great bulk of the funds required for development, so that a relatively small obligation remains to remit abroad for interest."

Significant evidence of the development of Palestine in the last 18 years is furnished by the growth of its foreign trade. In 1920-21, Palestine imported goods valued at \$26,000,000. In 1935 the imports amounted to \$90,000,000. During the same period there was a fivefold expansion of exports.

When the Palestinian foreign trade is compared with that of other Arab countries, the result is indeed remarkable. On a per capita basis, Palestine's foreign trade is almost four times as great as that of Egypt, six times that of Syria, and five and one-half times that of Iraq. This is reflected in the standard of living to be observed in the Holy Land.

The astonishing progress in foreign commerce made by Palestine because of Jewish endeavor is in turn responsible for the development of the country's shipping facilities, such as the building of the new port of Haifa and the projected construction of a harbor in Tel Aviv. It has been justly declared that these are developments of revolutionary consequences to the arterial system of the British Empire.

Palestine has acquired a new strategic role as an outlet for the Mosul oil fields as a key to both land and air routes to the east. Its ports are performing functions hitherto fulfilled by the Egyptian ports on the Suez Canal. Haifa is on the way to become the key Mediterranean harbor to the hinterland of Syria, Iraq, and Persia. Its tonnage has more than doubled since its completion a few years ago.

It is apparent that the influx of Jewish immigration into Palestine, accompanied as it is by a steady influx of new capital, lifted the country upward while the rest of the world was sinking into the depths of depression. Bank deposits steeply increased in recent years. Business expanded at an accelerated rate.

In 1934, when Jewish immigration reached large-scale proportions, 227 new companies, both Jewish and Arab, were incorporated

with a total authorized capital of \$11,000,000. An additional 35 companies trebled their capital. The revenue of the government grew correspondingly, and its beneficent expenditures were widely diffused. Thus the treasury was able to remit a large part of the agricultural taxes which weighed heavily on the poor Arab peasants and to launch public works for the employment mainly of Arab labor.

The dynamic power which the Jewish pioneers brought to Palestine cannot, however, be measured merely with yardsticks of economics. It has redeemed and liberated the soul of the Jew. When the conscience of mankind recognized the right of the Jews to have a national home in the land where their kings ruled, their prophets led and their psalmists sang, where their religion, language, culture, ideals, and folklore were developed and changed the history of the world, it set in motion a powerful national revival.

It was natural that this resurrection of the Jewish national spirit in the land of their ancestors should flower forth, among certain elements, in an ambition for a Jewish state.

It is an ambition which is not justified by the terms of the mandate, although Secretary of States Hughes, in his communication to Balfour of January 27, 1922, referred to the Jewish national home under the mandate as "a Jewish state."

This ambition was in direct conflict with the Pan-Arab nationalist movement, and it served to sharpen the conflict between the two main elements of the population of Palestine.

#### ARTICLE 4

Our interviews with the Grand Mufti, with the members of the Arab Commission to England, now back in Palestine, and with many effendis of intelligence and probity lead to the conclusion that there is trouble ahead from time to time unless the fears of both Jews and Arabs are terminated. This can be done either by agreement or by a different administration of the declared British policy under the mandate.

The Arabs, treating all who are combined in striking and terrorism as such, form two-thirds of the residents of Palestine. There are Christian and Moslem Arabs. There are many political factions among them. There is a wide gulf between the social status of effendis and fellahin (gentry and peasants).

The leaders of Arab opinion, among whom are many who possess a large share of the wealth of the country, represented to us that in the present strike and warfare all Arabic-speaking people in Palestine are united. The cultured priests, businessmen, landowners, and professional men among the Arabs claim that the masses of their race follow their leadership.

On the other hand, the murder of many Arabs by their coreligionists during the present disturbances, the strange absence from the country of certain Arab chiefs such as the mayor of Haifa who sought safety in Syria, the remaining of thousands of Arab workers on their jobs despite the terror of the strikers, all indicated disunity in the Arab camp.

The cause of the strike and the campaign of violence, as stated in the memorandum submitted by the Arab Women's Committee of Jerusalem to the World Peace Congress at Brussels, in September 1936, is:

"It arose out of the nature of the mandate which was forcibly imposed upon the Arabs and which they persistently refused to recognize or accept."

In stating their case to us, the Arab spokesmen laid emphasis on the following claims:

That the rapidity and effectiveness of the development of a national home for Jews in Palestine had frightened them;

That it is contrary to natural justice that they who have been for 13 centuries a majority in a country they call their own, should be reduced to a position of numerical, political, and economic inferiority;

That they deny any right of the victorious Allies to impose on them what they call a foreign dominion, and that force would constantly be necessary to maintain a Jewish state in Palestine;

That the Arabs had been promised during the war, as the price for helping the Allies, unity and independence of the Arab countries, which they claim comprehended Palestine; and

That Palestine is geographically and ethnically an essential part of the Arab world, which should be included in a Pan-Arab federation.

We probed deeply into all of these grievances, in the course of our investigation, and frankly presented them to the leaders of the Jewish agency and the Jewish National Council, whose statements will be reported by me in subsequent articles.

"The Arabs need the Jews and the Jews need the Arabs," one influential Arab told me. "We are cousins and have no racial antipathy. Difference in religion does not cause the difficulty; we fear the Jews dominating us."

It was apparent from the beginning, however, that the Arabs have a powerful economic hold on the country, and that there was little merit in their claim of Jewish economic domination. In addition to the Arab ownership of 90 percent of the land of the country, the Arabs own at least one-half of the main industry of Palestine, the citrus development.

The banana trade of Jericho is wholly Arab, and the larger part of the vegetables in the Holy Land are produced by Arabs. In the last 8 years alone, the Arabs extended their olive, fig, and vine cultivation from 197,000 to 633,000 dunams. (A dunam is one-fourth of an acre.)

The primary political character of the conflict in Palestine is shown by the appeal of the Arab women's committee to the World Peace Conference, in which it is alleged:

"In no other land in the world one feels so unsafe or insecure as in Palestine \* \* \* because a riot is liable to take place for the simplest reason and might be accompanied by acts of violence on either side, irrespective of the consequences."

Thus far the evidence is conclusive that the acts of violence are premeditated and almost entirely committed by Arabs. The insecurity of the situation is shown by the four different strikes and outbreaks by Arabs which have occurred in 1921, 1929, 1933, and 1936.

#### ARTICLE 5

"We want the Arab population of Palestine to be contented. We want the good will of the Arabs. At the Birth of Christ the population of the country was 4,000,000, sustained by the standards of production of that time. There is room for the Jew in Palestine. There is no other place for him to go."

The speaker was Moshe Chertok, the official head of the Jewish Agency in Palestine. This body is recognized under the mandate as a governmental instrument for the establishment of the Jewish National Home. In the course of our conference with the leaders of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, Mr. Chertok presented to us an effective answer to the Arab claims.

After extending to our commission an official welcome in the name of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Chertok began:

"The Arab case divides itself into economic and political claims. On the economic side, the Arabs have no case. The Jewish development of Palestine has made the Arabs richer. The huge funds of capital poured into the country by the Jews since the World War have filtered through and been diffused among the entire population.

"At every step, the Jew had to pay the Arab. When the Jewish immigrant arrived, he had to pay the Arab boatman to bring him ashore. When he looked for shelter, he paid rent to an Arab. When he bought land, it was from an Arab. When he purchased food, he paid an Arab for it.

"As the Jews developed their own production, they also developed markets for export to neighboring Arab and other foreign countries. At the same time there has been a rise in imports to Palestine. This development gave employment to everybody, and enormously increased the revenue of the government.

"The government mainly serves the Arab population. The Jew is able to take care of himself. If the Jews are exploiting the Arabs, as it is claimed, why is there no exodus of Arabs from Palestine? Why do the Arabs in the neighboring countries migrate to Palestine? Since the war, the Arab population has increased over 50 percent in this country, and the increase has been greatest in the location of Jewish settlements.

"On the political side, the majority of the Arabs might say that they prefer to eke out a poor living, so long as the country remained Arab and not Jewish.

"This point of view the conscience of the world cannot accept. There is no other country open to the Jews of Germany, Rumania, Poland. The Jews do not seek to establish themselves here at the expense of the Arabs. We have proved that our coming has improved the condition of all.

"Moreover, the Arabs have received as a result of the war independence in several countries. They have Iraq—Mesopotamia, they have the Hedjaz, they have Trans-Jordan, they have Egypt, and they have a semi-independent status under the French mandate in Syria.

"The 25,000,000 Arabs have a habitable area 30 times as large as that of Palestine. They have all the room for development and unity. Are not the Jews entitled to a corner of their own?"

"When the Jews were promised by the Balfour declaration a national home in Palestine, it included both sides of the Jordan. The Jordan was never a boundary. Subsequently, the British tore off Trans-Jordan and made it Arab. The Jews are denied the right to settle there. Yet it is 50 percent larger than Palestine and has only 25 percent of the population of Palestine."

When asked what was the stand of the Jewish agency with respect to the Arab demand for a stoppage of Jewish immigration, Mr. Chertok declared:

"Immigration must continue. In 1934 the country absorbed 45,000 immigrants, and yet there was a shortage of labor. In 1935 it absorbed 62,000 Jewish immigrants, and we still have a shortage of labor. So long as immigration can be economically absorbed without injury to the Arabs, it must continue.

"If a sudden change should occur in the economic condition of the country, we are prepared to come to an agreement with the Arabs. We are prepared to undertake not to buy land which would in the future displace Arabs, or to exchange land with Arab holders."

It was represented to Mr. Chertok that the Arabs claimed to fear the Jews becoming a majority in Palestine, to which he replied:

"An agreement not to become a majority would be impossible. The Jews of the world are pressing to enter the country. If we entered into such an agreement, what would prevent the upsetting of the balance?"

"Look at Trans-Jordan. In the law, it does not exclude Jews. But in reality, Jews are not allowed there. Yet Trans-Jordan was promised to both Jews and Arabs, and the British Government decided to reserve it for Arabs only.

"The present controversy on immigration would be settled if Trans-Jordan were to be opened to our people. One hundred thou-

sand Jews would gladly move there from this side of the Jordan. They would break ground and make room for more settlers.

"Politically, we Jews feel that a part of our body has been separated from us by cutting off Trans-Jordan from Palestine. But behind the Arab claims is the dream to abrogate the mandate and to build an independent Arab empire.

"In such an event, the alleged fear of the Jewish majority is meaningless. Even if we did bring in 5,000,000 Jews into Palestine, we would still remain a minority among the 25,000,000 Arabs in their proposed confederation or kingdom."

#### ARTICLE 6

The Jews of Palestine are willing to assure the Arabs permanent parity in the government of the country as a solution for Arab apprehensions of being dominated in the future by a Jewish majority.

A declaration to this effect was officially made to us by Mr. Barnard Joseph, the solicitor for the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, in the presence of Mr. Chertok and Dr. Ruppin, in the course of our conference with the three leaders.

"Numbers need not determine control," stated Mr. Joseph when the Arab claim of being frightened at the prospect of Jewish domination was called to his attention. "The control of a country is secured through the machinery of government. The answer to the problem is permanent parity of the two races in the government.

"We propose an international undertaking by Jews and Arabs not to seek control of the government, regardless of their numbers. It could be done by the Jewish Agency entering into a waiver of right to dominate.

"We deny the right of the Arabs to exclusive control of Palestine. We admit their right to remain here. We claim, however, that this is our country as much as their own. The right of the Jews to come here is recognized by the entire world."

In answer to the argument of certain Arabs that Palestine had for 13 centuries been their country and that the Jewish immigrants were invaders, Dr. Ruppin, a recognized economist and historian, replied:

"One hundred years ago Palestine had only 100,000 inhabitants. The Jews have always been in Palestine. Through the centuries Jewish communities remained in the Holy Land. The Arabs were not a distinct national group in Palestine; they were only a fraction of the whole.

"Besides, the country was not Arab. It was Turkish. Turkey ceded it to Great Britain. The Jews fought on the side of the Allies against Turkey. The Arabs of Palestine did not."

Mr. Joseph pointed out:

"There can be no comparison of the coming of the Jews to Palestine with a foreign invasion, for the situation of Palestine has no parallel in the world and the situation of the Jews has no equal among the other peoples.

"We made the history of Palestine. The Jewish people have no other national home. We have demonstrated that Palestine is capable of absorbing large masses of immigrants."

Mr. Joseph denied that there was any widespread fear among the Arabs that they might lose the country to the Jews and pointed out that but 6 months ago the two peoples lived and worked together in amity. He continued:

"But even if such a fear has come into existence because of political agitation, justice requires that we should be allowed to settle here in spite of that feeling.

"The Arabs are well provided for. They have ample space for their people and the development of their culture. They ought to be just to the Jews."

The Arab claim that the promise early in the World War made by the British high commissioner for Egypt, McMahon, to the

sherif of Mecca to give the Arabs unity and independence also comprehended Palestine came up for discussion next.

The Zionist records showed that King Feisal, the son of the sherif of Mecca, had entered into a solemn agreement with Chaim Weizmann, the leader of the world Zionist organization, specifically recognizing the Jewish national home in Palestine as guaranteed by the Balfour Declaration.

In the course of a conference with a group of Arab leaders in Haifa our senatorial commission was flatly informed that this agreement had never been signed, and was in fact a Zionist invention. I therefore pursued this matter in our interview with Mr. Chertok and his associates of the Jewish Agency, who promised to produce irrefutable proof of its authenticity.

When our commission reached Brindisi, Italy, on the way back from Palestine, we were met by Mr. Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Jewish Agency, who produced a facsimile of the original treaty between Mr. Weizmann and King Feisal, which contained a reservation purporting to be in the handwriting of the King himself.

King Feisal was an intimate of Lawrence of Arabia, who was his chief counselor. It so happened that Lawrence himself made the translation of Feisal's note. This document of Lawrence, the champion of the Arab cause, was published in the London Times on June 10, 1936, as a reproduction of his own handwriting, and is sufficient to establish the authenticity of the historic Arab-Jewish convention.

The pact, signed in London on January 3, 1919, is a treaty of friendship between the two races. It provides for measures "as will afford the fullest guarantees for carrying into effect the British Government's declaration of November 2, 1917."

It specifies that "All necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale, and as quickly as possible to settle Jewish immigrants on the land."

The reservation translated by Lawrence makes the pact dependent on the fulfillment by the British Government of the demands of King Feisal's memorandum in which he asked for the independence of Arabic areas in Asia.

Feisal had accepted Palestine from the area, in his address to the supreme council of the peace conference of January 29, 1919, as follows:

"On account of its universal character, I shall leave Palestine on one side for the mutual consideration of all parties interested. With this exception, I ask for the independence of the Arabic areas enumerated in the memorandum."

#### ARTICLE 7

"The Arabs in Palestine cannot get along without the Jews. The Jews in Palestine cannot get along without the Arabs."

This striking statement was made to me by an educated Arab of distinguished family, whose identity must be withheld. His point of view was so at variance with the official Arab attitude, and his approach to the Jewish question so constructive, that it shed a new light on the crisis in Palestine. He commented:

"So long as we live in the same country as cousins, we ought to cooperate. The Jews make the mistake of not employing more Arabs in industry. It would build up means of negotiation and maintaining peace.

"I am an Arab and if I want to put up a building I engage some Jews for the job. But if a Jew wants to build, he does not engage Arabs. The Rutenberg Electrical Works has some 800 employees, but there are only 5 Arabs among them.

"The Jews should include the teaching of Arabic in their schools, just as we have introduced the study of Hebrew in our schools. Twenty percent of the Arabs know Hebrew

perfectly, while 30 percent of the Jews do not speak Hebrew themselves.

"The Arabs, on the other hand, do not cooperate with each other. The Arab who has a government position is always exposed to attempts of other Arabs to put him out and get his place.

"If Palestine were given over completely to the Jews they could not survive here, because they would be subject to constant attacks by Arabs from Syria or Iraq or Egypt. As a small state, they would be surrounded by enemies. A Jewish kingdom could never survive.

"The Arabs could not live alone in Palestine and make progress, because they have not enough capital to run the show. Where there is mixed Jewish and Arab capital, as in certain banks, cement works, potash plants, it works all right. The Jews cannot boycott the Jewish interests, and the Arabs cannot boycott the Arab interests."

When asked for the cause of the present conflict in Palestine, this Arab spokesman laid it to the desire of the Mufti to have sole control of the budget of the Moslem community, which furnishes a revenue of about \$600,000 annually. He declared:

"The proposed legislative council was the cause of the strike. The Mufti wanted to keep his power. If we had a legislative council, it would have the power to check the books of the Supreme Moslem Council. Now the Mufti controls all the moneys himself.

"It was planned to have proportionate representation in the legislative council of all the Arab parties. The Mufti would have one representative but seven others would represent the other parties. These seven would insist on auditing the books of the Mufti.

"It was for the same reason that the proposal for a legislative Council made to the Arabs by Sir Herbert Samuel in 1922 fell through. Then the Jews would have had but one representative and the Arabs eleven. The Mufti wanted to keep his hands on the treasury of the Supreme Moslem Council.

"The Mufti stays in power with the help of the British Government. This government wants to have two Arab parties, so as to let them fight each other."

On the sore point of the land question in Palestine, my Arab informant differed sharply from the Arab leaders of the strike. He said:

"If Arabs in the agricultural districts have been dispossessed, it is the fault of the Arab owners. Take the case of an Arab woman proprietor of several small villages. If she sells a village to Jewish colonists, the Arab occupants have to move out. A law enacted about a year ago requires that the dispossessed be provided with other lands or funds for the purchase of parcels elsewhere.

"Most of the Arabs who have sold agricultural tracts for Jewish colonization are not Palestinians, but Syrians."

The main theme of this Arab spokesman's statement was the view that it was mutually advantageous for the Jews and the Arabs to cooperate. Because of the prevailing terror, it was not a popular stand for an Arab to take. Many of his compatriots had suffered direct consequences for preaching a Jewish-Arab understanding.

#### ARTICLE 8

Where Sodom and Gomorrah were wiped out by brimstone and fire, according to the Bible, a miracle of modern industry has appeared since the present world depression. The minerals of the Dead Sea are now supplying the life of fertilizer to many corners of the earth.

The potash industry of Palestine today epitomizes the epic of the industrialization of the Holy Land. But a decade ago the agricultural output of the country far exceeded industrial production. Today the output of industry in Palestine is already greater than all the farming produce, including that of the citrus groves.

The potash deposits of the Dead Sea, where up-to-date chemical plants began operations on January 1, 1930, are sufficient to supply the present demands of the world for 2,000 years. They contain over 2,000,000,000 tons of potassium chloride, an article vital to all vegetation. Every year the Jordan carries to the Dead Sea, which lies 1,300 feet below sea level, 40,000 additional tons of this valuable salt.

During our stay in Jerusalem we came into frequent contact with Maj. Thomas G. Tulloch, a Scot, one of the original promoters of the Palestine Potash Co., who has spent most of his time in Palestine since 1928. The credit for the pioneering work in the exploitation of the Dead Sea minerals belongs to a Jewish engineer, Mr. Novomeysky, now the managing director of the works, who as early as 1911 envisaged the vast potentialities of the industry for Palestine.

Despite the strike and the terror, the Potash Co. was operating on a normal schedule while we were in Palestine.

Said Major Tulloch:

"The Arabs and Jews in our plant are friendly and work together peacefully. For every vacancy we have there are 100 applications by Arabs to work with the Jews.

"At the north end of the Dead Sea we employ 400 workers—one-half Arabs and one-half Jews. We pay the Jews twice as much for an 8-hour day. The Jewish worker has to pay dues to a sick-benefit fund, to a library fund, to the food commissary, and for transportation. These deductions from the pay envelopes are made by the company, by arrangement with the Jewish Federation of Labor. At the end of the month the Arab takes home more money than the Jew.

"Besides, the Jew does more work than the Arab. He has more stamina. He does his job more intelligently. Many of the Jewish workers are university graduates.

"We have much work that requires skilled labor. The Arabs are not up to it.

"The Arab laborers do not protest against the lower wages paid to them. Sometimes the effendis try to make a stir about it. When a certain Arab political leader kicked against our wage scale, I replied 'When you Arab employers pay your Arab workers as much as we pay the Jews, we will do likewise.'

"During the last riots the leading firebrand of the white-collar effendis, while out on bail, held a meeting in the market place of Jericho. He appealed to the Arabs to get their guns and follow him. The whole country, he asserted, was going to be given over to the Jews, and the Arabs should fight against it.

"'We don't care, effendi, if the government gives the land to the Jews,' replied the Arab workers. 'They treat us better than the effendis do. Will you take care of our wives and children if we are killed in the fight?' The meeting broke up in an uproar."

Major Tulloch, who emphasized the fact that he was neither a Jew nor an Arab, was of the opinion that the Jews and Arabs wanted to and could live peacefully together.

The disturbances in the country, according to him, were not due to economic grievances, but to a political agitation instigated by certain Arab politicians who seek political power so as to retain their domination over the Arab peasantry.

The industrial development of Palestine, due to Jewish initiative, is still in its infancy, according to Major Tulloch. His company is now building a second plant at the southern end of the Dead Sea. Being a newcomer in the field, the Palestine potash industry encountered fierce competition in the world market. After 5 years of existence, it was recently admitted into the international cartel which fixes the world price of potash.

The development of a chemical industry in the Holy Land, like the whole process of the industrialization of Palestine, provides a refutation of the claim that the Jews have

been displacing the Arabs. The industries of Palestine were virtually nonexistent 15 years ago. They do not draw upon the wealth of the country, but bring to Palestine entirely new sources of wealth, new opportunities, new fields of employment. The Economic Research Institute of Jerusalem observes:

"In their capital, the Jews bring from abroad the original wherewithal for the erection of new enterprises. In their persons, they bring the skill, intelligence and labor needed to set the factories in motion, and the consuming power on which success must depend.

"In industry, there can be no element of displacement; it represents in its entirety a net addition to the wealth of the country."

## ARTICLE 9

The handwriting on the walls of Palestine today spells out the question:

What will Great Britain do to satisfy the combating ideas and ideals of her wards?

Great Britain, between opposing interests of Jews and Arabs, between imperial policy and international obligations, occupies a position of "extreme difficulty and delicacy," as Lord Balfour characterized it in his letter to Secretary Hughes.

We found complaints against the mandatory by both Jews and Arabs. By Jews, that the mandatory is not executing the mandate in maintaining peace and security; that it is not actively putting into effect the Balfour Declaration; that it is delinquent in protecting industry by tariffs; that it discriminates against Jews in respect to taxation and government support for education and public health. By the Arabs, that the mandate is unjust and that it ought to be abrogated or revised or differently interpreted and enforced.

Arab independence and unity is in the atmosphere. The Hedjaz, Lebanon, Egypt, Trans-Jordania, Iraq, and Syria have come into the promised state of independence. This excites the Arabs of Palestine to maneuver into a condition for unity with them, when and if a consolidation is made.

This agitation is promoted on the theory that Palestine was included in the British promise made to Arabs to induce them to join the Allies against Turkey.

Assuming that legally all prior promises became merged in the mandate, nevertheless, politically, the question enters into the cause of every Arab strike.

Therefore one of the definite acts of the mandatory tending toward peace and tranquility ought to be the clarification of the record which the British claim proves that Palestine was excepted from that promise. The white papers of 1922 asserted:

"The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was thus excluded from Sir H. McMahon's pledge."

The mandate in terms agreed to July 2, 1922, did not come into effect until September 29, 1923. If the Arabs dissented, they ought to have spoken then, but did not do so. Nevertheless, today the point is debated largely because there is disagreement regarding the record.

An alternative thereto is to treat Palestine as a conquered country—a country which failed to join its Arabic neighbors against Turkey—and to face boldly and firmly the continuing resentment of the conquered people.

To temporize by suspending labor immigration and making concessions every time the Arabs strike, as has been done in the previous strikes, settles nothing and invites further lawlessness and disorder.

As a consequence of the war, Palestine ceased to be under the sovereignty of the state which formerly governed her, and she was, therefore, placed under mandate.

Great Britain's obligation under the mandate differs from that of other mandatories in other mandates in this particular:

"The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political administration and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home."

Therefore, all details of government should promote that objective, and should not hinder it.

British policy under the mandate was published in Palestine July 7, 1922, and made binding by royal instructions August 14, 1922, and contained the following:

"2. A Jewish national home will be founded in Palestine. The Jewish people will be in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. But His Majesty's Government have no such aim as that Palestine should become as Jewish as England is English.

"3. Nor do His Majesty's Government contemplate the disappearance or subordination of the Arab population, language, or culture.

"4. The status of all citizens of Palestine will be Palestinian, and no section of the population will have any other status in the eyes of the law."

Vigorous execution of that policy probably would put an end to the discussion about an independent Arabic state in Palestine. Moreover, it would prevent the growth of the ambition, now budding, for a Jewish state in Palestine.

American public sentiment should be frankly expressed in support of the mandate and in approval of its strict administration according to the British policy laid down during the negotiations of its terms. It would strengthen the arm of the mandatory and discourage the employment of violence and civil disobedience to induce either the abrogation of the mandate or a modification of its essential obligations.

## ARTICLE 10

After 14 years Great Britain should have accomplished in Palestine the following policy proclaimed in the royal instructions of August 14, 1922.

"His Majesty's Government intend to foster the establishment of a full measure of self-government in Palestine, and, as the next step, a legislative council with a majority of elected members will be set up immediately."

I am persuaded that a legislative council in which parity of representation of Jews and Arabs is maintained would allay the fears of both respecting majority and minority rights. There would not be so much emphasis on immigration as a cause of turbulence. Numbers of population need not determine control. Control is maintained through implements of government, regardless of numbers.

The duty of Great Britain respecting immigration is not definite. It is discretionary as to what will prejudice non-Jewish "rights and position," and what are "suitable conditions." But the mandatory "shall facilitate Jewish immigration," while insuring the rights and position of other sections of the population.

British policy on this vexed subject was, in 1922:

"Immigration will not exceed the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals."

Here the passivity of government has changed the yardstick into a sliding scale.

In 1930, experts reported that the economic capacity of absorption was exhausted. Since then the Jewish population has more than doubled and the Arab population has increased by 13 percent. There has been no growth of unemployment and no evidence that the indigenous population has been prejudiced in rights or position.

On the contrary, standards of life have risen, health and education have reached out their benign influence farther over all sections, the country's wealth has surpassed by several times the total progress of the

first postwar decade, on which the experts based their inquiries.

The capacity for absorption is dynamic, not static. It does not depend on natural conditions alone. The opportunities for absorption have been created by immigration itself. A market of buyers, a supply of laborers, and the importation of capital are the ingredients of economic expansion. All these have been brought by the immigrants.

Government can increase further the capacity by the provision of lands—public and waste—the protection of industry and labor with protective tariffs, the granting of concessions and credit facilities.

There is no economic reason for suspending immigration now. A clear and definite denial of this demand of the Arab high committee ought to be made and adhered to.

The mandatory will no doubt establish the fact that there is no just ground for grievance in the purchase of land by Jews from Arabs. The price paid is high. No Arab is obliged to sell. Every cultivator must be assured another location, if he wishes it, before a purchase can be consummated. The government requires this. This Arab right is a stiff brake on Jewish purchasers.

There are large stretches of waste but potentially rich soil offering vast possibilities of development. With irrigation and other forms of capital investment there is reason to believe that Palestine may continue to expand in population and prosperity to the point of equaling more densely populated countries of the world.

Her density of population compares with some other agricultural countries as follows:

Palestine.....	46.7
Rumania.....	63.7
Hungary.....	95.0
France.....	76.0
Italy.....	136.1

A comparison nearer by is:

Palestine.....	43.7
Lebanese Republic.....	92.91

Land purchases should not be prohibited. On the contrary, articles 6 and 11 of the mandate, providing for facilitation of settlement of Jews on the land and intensive cultivation, should be actively administered.

Trans-Jordan, which was included in the Balfour Declaration, and regarding which Great Britain made a proviso in the Amman Declaration enabling her to fulfill her international obligations in respect of the territory, should be opened up to Jewish settlement whenever it becomes necessary in the performance of the mandate. Trans-Jordan is 50 percent larger in area than Cis-Jordan (Palestine west of the Jordan) and has a population of only 25 percent of the latter.

## ARTICLE 11

It was a mistake on the part of the British authorities in Palestine, in our opinion, to deal with the Arab strike and violence leniently in the beginning.

As early as May 5, 1936, after anti-Jewish riots, many murders and destruction of fruit trees and crops had taken place, the High Commissioner received the members of the Supreme Arab Committee and addressed them to the effect that:

They should set their faces "against all illegal acts, whether of murder, arson, or any form of civil disobedience"; that they should send a delegation to London instead of supporting the strike; and that they should "make it known without delay to the public" that they do not associate themselves with any illegal acts.

And this was the Arab reply given the same day:

"The strike would continue; the district committees had already decided to favor a civil disobedience movement; they had already decided to defer the mission to London. \* \* \*

One hundred and fifty-one Arab officials of the government of Palestine issued a memorandum directed against the essential features of the mandate under which they hold office and to the support of which they are bound.

Subsequently, the British armed forces in Palestine were augmented, we were informed, until there were understood to be 16,000 of them when we left the country.

Following our departure, the British Government decided to increase this military force considerably by moving from England fresh reserves under the command of Lieutenant General Dill.

Yet martial law was not imposed upon the localities where crime and destruction were most frequent. From day to day the situation got more out of control, and several major engagements were reported in the press.

If, in the initial stages of the outbreaks, the anti-riot ordinance passed 3 years ago had been put into effect, the mandatory government would have been implemented to suppress all the disturbances.

"Leniency to the individual is severity to the state," mildly represents the lesson taught by the situation in Palestine today.

Last week, it was officially announced, the strike was called off in Palestine by the Supreme Arab Committee. But the violence let loose through a mistaken policy has not ceased, according to the dispatches in the press. The attacks by guerrilla bands on Jewish settlements are reported to continue.

What will Great Britain do to settle the conflicting interests?

It is my guess that she will suppress with a stern hand the lawlessness, defiance, and sedition which terrorize the inhabitants and threaten the efficacy of the mandate as a form of government.

After that, from the standpoint of the British Empire, she will shake off the passivity which has encouraged the repetition of these threats to a rebuilt Palestine, loyal to her, and engage with vigor in the execution of her declared policy under the mandate.

She will promote the economic welfare of her colonial system by encouragement of the already great expansion of wealth involved in the creation of the Jewish national home. And she will smother the spark of plots and conspiracies against British Government elsewhere which the success of Arab civil disobedience might blow into a conflagration.

Diplomatically, Great Britain cannot afford to back the wrong horse. On the issue now raised of performance or nonperformance of the mandate, the contenders are not limited to the Jews of the world against the Arabs of the world. They include the treaty nations, of which the United States is one.

Therefore, it is rational to expect that after peace and order are restored in Palestine, the unfounded ambitions of certain Jewish and Arab elements that the mandatory could or would hand to either of them political control over the other, will probably be definitely nullified. A government in which all citizens are Palestinians and in which Jewish and Arab parity of power is guaranteed will be fostered.

These are the deductions of one to whom the facts seem clear and compelling. By the achievement of these measures, a new, permanent, and responsible political entity would be brought into being in a zone where good order and strength are needed for the peace of the world.

In the fulfillment of the principles of the mandate and the declared policy of the mandatory power, a stable supporting public sentiment among the American people, frankly announced, may be of great value. It may help to lighten the load assumed by the mandatory, in accordance with the spirit of Lord Balfour's letter to Secretary of State Hughes, in the performance of the great

task of establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine.

#### REPORT OF SENATOR DANIEL O. HASTINGS

##### ARTICLE 1

If one is to get an accurate picture of the present troubles in Palestine, it is necessary to know something of the background of the recent political control of the country. For something like 400 years prior to the World War, Palestine was in the hands of the Turks.

As early as 1891 that heroic Jewish figure, Theodor Herzl, became the leader of the idea of a Jewish state. Herzl insisted that the Jews are a distinct nation, whose problems can be solved only by restoring them to a normal national life in a land of their own. By 1902 he had interested the British Government in his plans. He died early in life, but not until he had given the impetus to the Zionist movement and organization throughout the world.

There appear to be three distinct views today among Jews with respect to Palestine. One view is that Palestine must ultimately become a Jewish state, a nation of Jews, controlled by the Jews. The second is that Palestine must be looked upon merely as a spiritual center for Jewry.

Then there is a third view, the view of the present Jewish Agency for Palestine which is somewhere between these two, namely, that Palestine must offer to the Jews of the world a place of refuge, and that they must be permitted to immigrate as rapidly as the economic condition of Palestine may warrant, and the fact that Jews may ultimately become the majority in Palestine must not be taken into consideration.

The official Zionist leaders who adhere to the third view do not demand that Palestine be now considered as a Jewish state, and express the willingness to assure the Arabs that regardless of their numbers they will never demand anything politically more than parity.

Those Zionists who insist that Palestine shall become a Jewish state call attention to the statement made by President Wilson, in responding to a memorandum formulating the Jewish claim to Palestine, namely:

"I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and our people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a Jewish commonwealth."

Stress is also laid in this connection upon a statement by Secretary of State Hughes, in a communication addressed to Lord Balfour on January 22, 1922, to wit: "Even in case a Jewish state should survive" (in Palestine). This reference to a Jewish state was made in the course of the negotiations for the British-American convention in which the United States gave its consent to the British trusteeship over Palestine.

The Balfour Declaration was made on November 2, 1917. The American Jewish Congress, meeting in Philadelphia on December 15, 1918, in approving the Balfour document, added the very significant words "Jewish commonwealth."

When Dr. Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization, was asked at the peace conference in Paris, in 1919, by Mr. Lansing, the American representative, what he meant by the Jewish national home, he replied that "There should ultimately be such conditions that Palestine should be just as Jewish as America is American and England English."

On December 2, 1917, Lord Cecil, a member of the British Cabinet said:

"Our wish is that Arabian countries shall be for the Arabs, Armenia for the Armenians, and Judea for the Jews."

A study of the history of the Balfour Declaration shows, in my opinion, quite conclusively that the Jews of the world were justifi-

fied in believing that the issuance of the Balfour Declaration intended to assure them a country they could control and call their own.

I think also that the Jews of the world were justified in believing that Palestine meant the country on both sides of the Jordan, and not the present western area from which Trans-Jordan has been severed and set up as a separate Arab kingdom under the aegis of the British High Commissioner in Jerusalem.

When the World War was over and the time came to translate a general declaration into a specific contract, we find a remarkable document known as the mandate for Palestine, which the Jews were, of course, compelled to accept.

There is, in my judgment, but one important definite promise in the mandate in which the Jews are interested, and that is the promise to place the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine.

There is a technical way out for the British Government of every other promise in it. You may offer strong arguments against the British and Arab interpretations of the mandate, but it is difficult to put your finger on anything definite. There is nothing in the mandate itself to justify the claim that the Jews have a right to make Palestine into a Jewish state.

One of the great troubles of the situation in Palestine today, as I see it, is that the Jews were led to believe for 5 years at least, from 1917, when the Balfour Declaration was made, to 1922, when the mandate was approved, that ultimately Palestine was to become a political unit, a nation belonging to the Jewish race.

##### ARTICLE 2

The Jews have made wonderful progress in Palestine in all things that make for healthier and better lives. They have made the Holy Land a progressive country with modern improvements, whereas it had made practically no progress for centuries before the war. This progress is due, in a large part, to the loyalty and generosity of the Jews in all parts of the world outside of Palestine, particularly the Jews of the United States.

One of the greatest assets to the world in the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine is that it has "become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride." In these words did the British Government, on the eve of the approval of the mandate, define one of its objectives in Palestine.

The trouble in Palestine today is partly due, as former disturbances have been due, to a lack of a definite policy with respect to the interpretation and the administration of the mandate.

Any conflicts arising between Jews and Arabs, as to their respective rights in Palestine after the World War, can be settled only in the light of the provisions of the mandate, plus any papers interpreting it.

The obligations of the mandate are placed upon the British Government and consist chiefly of the following:

1. "For placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home \* \* \*"

2. "Shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions \* \* \* while ensuring that the rights and positions of other sections of the population are not prejudiced."

The British Government has given its own definition of what is meant by the development of a Jewish national home by stating that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of

the existing Jewish community. The official definition continues:

"But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide a full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance."

The policy that immigration into Palestine may be permitted as rapidly as the immigrants can be economically absorbed is resented by Arabs because of the fear that the Jews may become a majority in Palestine and ultimately impose upon them Jewish control.

If immigration is permitted until the Jews have a majority in Palestine and then it should be determined that the country was in a position to manage its own affairs and British control and protection were withdrawn, you would have all that the most ambitious Zionist could expect.

It is this condition and this fear on the part of Arabs that underlie the present crisis. Peace between the Jew and Arab in Palestine depends upon a firm policy of the British Government declaring a definite parity between the two races in the political control of the country.

It might be well to note here what the Arab has been doing since the 19th of April last. The Arabs began to organize in the fall of 1935 preparatory to calling a strike. When the strike was called and the order given to close all the business establishments, those of the Arab owners who did not obey found themselves in real trouble. They were beaten, their property was destroyed, and a real reign of terror was inaugurated.

The Arab political leaders admitted to us their responsibility for closing the shops, as part of the strike program, but did not admit their responsibility for the murders and other acts of violence in the country. But the general impression in Palestine was that these leaders were doing nothing to stop the terror. There has been instilled in the minds of the Arab youth the idea that he is fighting for his freedom and that what he is doing is a patriotic service to his country.

The Arabs admit that the Jews have done great things for Palestine. The good roads, schools, hospitals, and other modern improvements are largely due to Jewish influence and capital. The Arabs have sold lands to the Jews at enormous prices.

An acre of poor undeveloped land in Palestine, which can be made suitable for the growing of oranges, can be readily sold for \$500. An Arab peasant will work in a Jewish orange grove, learn how to cultivate oranges, save his money, sell half of his land to a Jewish settler, and use the money to put the balance of his land in a condition to raise citrus.

A thousand and one instances could be given as to how the Jews have helped the Arab improve his standard of living. But the Arab political agitators disregard these economic factors and pay no attention to the statement of the Jewish representatives in Palestine that the Jews are not seeking political domination.

My own judgment is that there is no foundation for the fear propagated in the minds of the Arabs that the Jews are about to purchase all the Arab land and thus drive the Arabs from the country. There is enough cultivable land, or land that could be made cultivable to take care of several hundred thousand more Jewish agriculturists, and all to the advantage of the Arabs in Palestine.

#### ARTICLE 3

Perhaps the greatest miracle of the Jewish colonization of Palestine has been the transformation of small traders and intellectuals from eastern Europe into successful farmers. These children of the Ghetto, who had been removed from agriculture for many centuries, not only changed their habits overnight, but changed the face of the Holy Land almost overnight.

No traveler in Palestine today can fail to be impressed by the large stretches of redeemed soil which had lain barren and arid for generations prior to the coming of the Jewish pioneer. Forests, groves, and orchards dot the countryside and offer a striking contrast to those deserted tracts still awaiting the labor of rejuvenation.

The report of the high commissioner on the administration of Palestine says:

"The most striking result in this sphere that has been achieved during the last few years has been in the Valley of Esdraelon. When I first saw it in 1920 it was a desolation. Four or five small and squalid Arab villages, long distances apart from one another, could be seen on the summits of low hills here and there. For the rest, the country was uninhabited.

"There was not a house, not a tree. Along a branch of the Hejaz Railway an occasional train stopped at deserted stations. A great part of the soil was in the ownership of absentee Syrian landlords. The River Kishon, which flows through the valley, and the many springs which feed it from the hillsides, had been allowed to form a series of swamps and marshes and, as a consequence, the country was infested with malaria."

Then the Jewish National Fund acquired about 51 square miles of the valley. Young pioneers descended into it, formed labor gangs, crushed rock, built roads, dug trenches, erected houses and schools and factories. Continues the report of the High Commissioner:

"All of the swamps and marshes within the area that has been colonized have been drained and cases of malaria are proportionately rare. An active trade in dairy produce has sprung up, mostly finding a market by means of the railway, in Haifa.

"The whole aspect of the valley has been changed. The wooden huts of the villages, gradually giving place to red-roofed cottages, are dotted along the slopes; the plantations of rapidly growing eucalyptus trees begin to give a new character to the landscape; in the spring the fields of vegetables, or of cereals, cover many miles of land, and what 5 years ago was little better than a wilderness is being transformed before our eyes into a smiling countryside."

This valley is now the most compact Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine. In the last 15 years the number of Jewish land colonies has grown from 45 to 173. In 1919 there were 10,500 Jews in rural communities. In 1935 there were 72,700.

Striking is the intensive farming methods introduced by the Jews in the country. The Jewish farmer produces more than twice as much wheat per acre as the Arab peasant, three times as much grapes, and the yield of milk of the Jewish dairy farmer per cow is actually seven times as great as that of the Arab.

The application of scientific farming by the Jewish settlers has brought agricultural machinery into Palestine for the first time in its history. The import of these modern farming implements has been growing rapidly in the last 5 years. As compared with Palestine, the three neighboring Arab countries show a negligible use of agricultural machinery. Even Egypt, with its great cotton industry, imported in 1934 but 7.1 per head of population of the Palestinian import of such machinery.

Jewish enterprise has made Palestine, within the space of a little more than a decade, into the second citrus-exporting country in the world. The area under oranges and lemons has increased more than eightfold between 1922 and 1935. The value of the exports of this commodity rose from \$1,000,000 in 1921 to nearly \$18,000,000 in 1935.

Nothing is as dramatic, however, in the story of agricultural progress of the Jew in Palestine as the discovery and development

of the country's unknown or unused water resources. For centuries the Arabs squatted on the land, without troubling to dig for water even in such places where a little effort could have brought it to the surface.

The Jewish immigrants pioneered in this direction with remarkable zeal and perseverance and tapped hidden water sources which miraculously expanded the seemingly limited arable area of the country. In the valley of Esdraelon alone 70 borings were made, of which 34 were successful.

Water-boring machinery of the most modern type is now being imported into Palestine at an increasing rate by the Jews. Not only have many old wells been made to yield greater supplies, but in Galilee and Samaria and other parts of Palestine water was discovered in places where hardly anybody ever dreamed of finding it.

Although the Jews own but one-twentieth of all the land in Palestine, the transformation which they wrought in its primitive agriculture within a decade and a half can be felt and seen from one end of the country to the other. That it has been accomplished by a people whose agricultural tradition goes back 2,000 years is a revelation of the love and sacrifice which they brought to the land of their ancestors.

#### ARTICLE 4

One of the main demands of the Arab political agitation in Palestine has been for the stoppage of Jewish purchase of land in the country.

An inquiry into this sore phase of the crisis in the Holy Land shows that there is no economic justification for the Arab claim. On the contrary, there is unquestioned evidence that the settlement of Jews in Palestine has brought great benefits to the Arab peasantry, or fellahin.

The price of land in Palestine is 20 times as high as it is 30 miles east of the Jordan for a unit of the same quality. The poor Arab peasant, who is usually in the clutches of the Arab usurers, has been enabled in recent years through the sale of some of his land to achieve independence for the first time in his life.

An impartial government investigator, C. F. Strickland, reports:

"There is in general much to be said for encouraging the fellah to sell a part of his irrigable land and to repay the claims of his creditors from the sale proceeds, and develop the remainder of his irrigable land with any surplus remaining."

Jewish immigration and agricultural developments have raised large numbers of poverty-stricken and degraded peasants to a new level of existence. It must be remembered that the greater part of the indigenous population of Palestine is just beginning to emerge from a semi-feudal state. The fellahin are dominated in every way by the powerful landlords, who are not interested in the development of their great estates.

The director of the agricultural experiment station in Syria as recently as 1928, reported:

"The fellahin, who work the land, live under conditions comparable with that of the bondsmen of the Charlemagne dynasty. No more than 20 percent of the gross product of the land remains to the fellah. \* \* \* It may almost be said that the big landlords are engaged not in the exploitation of the land, but in the exploitation of its cultivators. \* \* \* As under the existing system of taxation no charges are paid on uncultivated land, the big landlords can leave large areas untilled without incurring any losses."

This Asiatic condition has been profoundly disturbed by the coming of the Jewish colonists. The Jews are driven to buy land at any price, which makes the Jewish colonization effort different from any similar undertaking in the past in other parts of the world. The Arabs are not compelled to sell

their holdings. Commercial considerations do not determine the price of land in Palestine.

Another boon to Arab agriculture has been the urbanization of the country as a result of Jewish industrial development. The fellahin suddenly found at their thresholds an undreamed market for their produce, a market which has grown rapidly and demanded a varied supply. The Arabs went in for mixed farming, whereas before they depended on one or two cereals.

As the depression in the United States has demonstrated, this kind of farming does not suffer much from world conditions, as its output does not depend upon world prices. In Palestine, the Arab agriculture escaped the great slump which struck the fellahin in Syria, Egypt, and Trans-Jordan in recent years.

The modern farming methods introduced by the Jewish colonists have not passed without beneficent effect upon Arab villages. They have begun to take on an improved appearance, as officially attested in the report of the High Commissioner. The march of progress in the country could not but leave its influence on the entire population. Jewish agriculture has awakened all agriculture, and set a new pace of enterprise and competition for the Arabs.

Due to the influx of Jewish capital and the flourishing condition of public finances in Palestine, there has been an astounding decrease in the tax burden on all agriculture in the country. In 1922, the agricultural taxes in Palestine furnished 15.3 percent of the government's revenue. In 1934, the percentage was 2.05. In absolute figures, disregarding the growth of the country, the fall in agricultural taxes has been from \$1,500,000 to \$850,000.

Since the majority of the Arab population is engaged in agriculture, this is a stupendous benefit provided largely from Jewish sources. Moreover, the government of Palestine has been enabled through its increased revenue to confer many other benefits on the fellahin, such as free distribution of seeds, low-interest loans, and agricultural exhibits and instruction.

There is little doubt that the break-up of the primitive feudal system in Palestine, with its attendant changes in the mode of life and educational standards of the Arabs, offers opportunities for agitators against the carriers of the new order of things, the Jewish immigrants.

The demand for the prohibition of Jewish acquisition of land is a political slogan, bound up with the pan-Arab nationalist movement which seeks the abrogation of the mandate. Strangely enough, it is a demand voiced mostly by Arab effendis who have disposed of large tracts to Jews and who have gained much from these transactions.

All the visible economic signs and official data in Palestine refute this political cry, and show that the coming of the Jews has brought a new era of prosperity to the Arab agricultural population, to the landlord as well as to the peasant.

#### ARTICLE 5

The British administration in Palestine has been weak and vacillating, and neither Jew nor Arab is satisfied with it, because he does not know what to expect next.

The olive branch is extended first to one side and then to the other, leaving both sides to believe that, with a little more pressure, a little more force, or a little more violence, additional concessions can be obtained.

It is true the British Government has an exceptionally hard position to fill under the mandate in Palestine. But I think the Jews do have a real grievance, because of a lack of vigorous effort to rid the country of the lawlessness that has existed for the past several months.

The mandate definitely promises security for the Jews in the establishment of a national home. No such security is now being given, although many thousands of soldiers are being maintained in Palestine.

If the British Government would announce a definite policy, and place officials in charge who were in sympathy with such a policy, and if necessary use such military power as was required to enforce it, there would, in my judgment, come into existence in Palestine a reasonably satisfactory condition.

A lasting solution, however, of the political antagonism between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine must be sought in Arab-Jewish cooperation.

Dr. Judah L. Magnes, the chancellor of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, which, I believe, will soon become one of the great universities of the world, had a real contribution to make on this subject. When I solicited his opinion, he referred me to a statement of his made in 1929, with the remark that it held good in 1936.

Said Dr. Magnes:

"I think I need hardly tell you my attitude towards the basic problem of the living together in the Holy Land of two peoples, Arabs and Jews, and of three religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

"You are aware that in my opinion it is necessary to find, and I think we have all of us not been nearly diligent enough in finding, ways of living and of working together, culturally, economically, socially, politically, and in every other way.

"You know, too, that in my opinion if we cannot find ways of peace and understanding, if the only way of establishing the Jewish National Home is upon the bayonets of some empire, our whole enterprise is not worth while, and it is better that the eternal people that has outlived many a mighty empire should possess its soul in patience, and plan and wait.

"It is one of the great civilizing tasks before the Jewish people to try to enter the Promised Land, not in the Joshua way, but bringing peace and culture, hard work and sacrifice and love, and a determination to do nothing that cannot be justified before the conscience of the world."

How sensible and inspiring. And it comes from a recognized spiritual leader of the Jewish community. If but the Arab spiritual leaders spoke the same language.

As a result of the persistent efforts of the Zionists for 50 years or more there exists in Palestine today a Jewish national home. There are something like 400,000 Jews there, and it is now possible for the Jewish child to begin at a Hebrew kindergarten and complete his education in a Hebrew university, without ever speaking anything but the Hebrew of the Prophets.

He may work on a Jewish farm, in a Jewish factory, live in an all-Jewish city, read a Hebrew newspaper, visit Hebrew theaters, have his controversies decided by a Jewish judge. This can be truly said to furnish the spiritual center for Jewry.

This is a great accomplishment, and the Jews of the world have a right to be proud of their achievements. But what satisfaction does the persecuted Jew, who has been driven from his native land, get from a spiritual center established in Palestine?

He may properly take pride in it, but from a practical point of view, what he needs is a place to live in and pursue a natural course without complaint and persecution by those about him.

I agree with Dr. Magnes that it is not practicable to find a suitable place for the Jewish refugee if the maintenance of law and order in such a place depends upon "the bayonets of some empire."

What, then, is the solution to the pressing problem of the millions of oppressed and destitute Jews forced to emigrate from central

and eastern Europe? I shall try to indicate it in the next article.

#### ARTICLE 6

The immigration question is the paramount issue in the crisis in Palestine. To the Zionist, the continuation of large-scale Jewish immigration into the Holy Land is of surpassing moment. To the Arabs, the stoppage of such immigration is a foremost political battle cry.

To the non-Zionist Jews and humanitarians of the world, the need for some haven for the persecuted Jews in central and eastern Europe is one of the great tragic problems of our times.

Is there a constructive answer to this question? I believe there is. While I see no place for all the many millions of persecuted Jews who might want to come to some such land as Palestine, I do see an opportunity to take care of large numbers of such refugees.

In my opinion several hundred thousand more Jews could be accommodated in Palestine itself. And several million additional Jewish fugitives could be provided for if they could cross the Jordan and be allowed to settle in Trans-Jordan.

Trans-Jordan was believed by the Jews to be included in Palestine proper at the time of the Balfour Declaration in November 1917. And I think it offers the hope in solving the practical and acute question of Jewish immigration.

The boundaries of Palestine were redrawn by the British Government 5 years after the Balfour Declaration so as to exclude the eastern half lying beyond the Jordan from the area of the Jewish National Home. Under the Turkish Empire, the frontiers of Palestine were part of a Province which comprised various loose and arbitrary districts.

This was officially recognized by the British Parliamentary Commission, headed by Sir Walter Shaw, sent to Palestine to investigate the causes of the riots and massacres in 1929. The Shaw report states:

"Viewed in the light of the last 6 centuries, Palestine is an artificial conception. Under the Ottoman regime, it formed part only of an administrative unit, the remainder of which consisted of areas now within the jurisdiction of the governments of other neighboring mandated territories. Its frontiers, too, are largely artificial. In many parts, they are frequented by nomad tribes, who, by intergovernmental agreement, are allowed unhindered passage across these frontiers."

The eastern frontiers of present-day Palestine are wide open to Arab migrants. But they are tightly closed to Jewish immigration. There seems to be considerable ground for the deep Jewish resentment against the chopping off of Trans-Jordan from Palestine and its exclusion from the sphere of Jewish settlement.

As far back as 1921 the conference of the British Labor Party protested against this policy in a resolution which declared:

"The conference calls upon the Government to put an end to the unnatural and harmful division of the British mandate territory and to effect the unity of eastern and western Palestine."

The British Government, however, effected an independent Arab kingdom in eastern Palestine or Trans-Jordan. The economic consequence of this measure has been the barring of Jewish immigration from Trans-Jordan.

Now Trans-Jordan is one and one-half times the size of present-day Palestine, and harbors but one-fourth of the population of the latter. It is a spacious and fertile land, sparsely inhabited, with no cities, and hardly developed. The Arab King and leaders of Trans-Jordan are understood to be eager for Jewish settlement and enterprise.

If Trans-Jordan could be opened to the Jews through a change of policy on the part

of the British Government which controls it, it would soon become a rich country. If the British Government could work out some plan of peace and good-will between the Arabs in Palestine and in Trans-Jordan, and have the mandate modified accordingly, it would not only go a long way in solving the problem of the Jews, but it would make out of these two countries rich and prosperous states.

It ought to be possible. The British Government has undertaken the administration of the mandate for Palestine. There is much to be said in favor of the British Government because of the natural difficulties involved in performing its duties under the mandate.

It is rather difficult, however, to find an adequate excuse for the plain violations by that great Government of the following provision of the mandate:

"The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion."

The situation in Palestine is not only serious for that country. It may involve world peace.

The opening of Trans-Jordan to the Jews would not only strengthen the position of Great Britain in the Near East, but would provide a solution to the urgent problem of Jewish immigration, which is at the bottom of the Arab-Jewish conflict in present-day Palestine.

In my judgment, this is the way to satisfy the patriotic visions of the conservative and reasonable people, both Jewish and Arab, who now occupy Palestine.

#### THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

[From the Sunday New York American and other Hearst newspapers of December 6, 1936]

The hearings before the British Royal Commission, headed by Earl Peel, now in session in Palestine, have already confirmed the salient findings of the unofficial senatorial commission sent to Palestine last summer by the Hearst newspapers.

The facts brought to light by the Royal Commission on the two major issues of the crisis in Palestine—immigration and purchase of land by Jews—are strikingly identical with those unearthed and reported by Senators Copeland, Austin, and Hastings.

While the Royal Commission is empowered to investigate the causes of the recent Arab strike and reign of terror and to recommend changes in the policy of the Palestine government, it has not been endowed with the right to alter the basic law of the mandate for Palestine aimed to establish a Jewish national home. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for the mandate is a trusteeship given to Great Britain by all the civilized nations of the world.

American interest in Palestine is in no sense a matter of meddling in foreign affairs.

It is an interest grounded in a solemn treaty concluded between the Government of the United States and the Government of His Britannic Majesty on December 3, 1924.

This convention, designed to protect the interests of American nationals in Palestine, recites in full the terms of the mandate.

According to the American-British Convention, the United States has given its consent to the British trusteeship over Palestine and has stipulated that its assent is required for any modification in the terms of that trusteeship.

It is noteworthy that it was the British Government which solicited America's active interest in the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, as expressed in a

formal communication from the late Lord Balfour to Secretary of State Hughes.

It follows that any inquiry into the situation in Palestine by Americans is fully warranted.

The observance of the treaty concerning Palestine is a matter of proper concern to the people and the Government of the United States.

The Jewish tragedy in central and eastern Europe, which is so interwoven with the upbuilding of a Jewish national home, makes it imperative to find a constructive solution for the crisis in Palestine. That such a solution can be found is indicated by the findings of the members of the unofficial senatorial commission, which may be summarized in the following six points:

1. The crisis in Palestine has two main springs:

First, the lack of a consistent and firm British administrative policy.

Second, the political conflict between Jewish and Arab aspirations.

As for the policy of the mandatory power, Great Britain as trustee assumed the obligations to place Palestine under conditions "as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home" and to "facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and encourage . . . close settlement by Jews on the land," without impairing the rights of other sections of the population.

These are plain duties. Admittedly they are difficult to carry out. A steady and definite policy is required in their performance.

Yet it is an open secret, as shown by Senator Copeland, that certain elements of the mandatory civil administration in Palestine are not in sympathy with the trust of their office, and look with disfavor upon the establishment of the Jewish national home.

This accounts for the vacillating policy pursued by the mandatory, which in turn cannot but encourage lawlessness and strife in the country.

2. The mandate definitely promised security to the Jewish settlers in Palestine.

The failure of the British trustee to provide such security is manifest. According to all the members of the Commission, there can be no adequate excuse for the patent violation of this elementary provision of the mandate. There can be no justification for the outrages committed against innocent Jewish men, women, and children in recent months in the Holy Land.

The injuries suffered by many American nationals, who had settled in Palestine under the protection of the American-British Convention, serve but to emphasize the deplorable failure of the mandatory government to maintain law and order in the land under its care. No compensation for their damaged property can adequately make up for months of exposure to a reign of terror.

3. The basic cause of the Arab-Jewish discord is political.

Certain Arab agitators, who are identified with the Pan-Arab nationalist movement, seek the establishment of an Arab state in Palestine, and make much of the fear that certain Jewish elements may seek the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Now, there is nothing in the mandate to justify such ambitions on either side.

The responsible Jewish leaders have offered the Arabs a mutual parity pact, which would insure both sides against domination by either.

If Great Britain would reaffirm her declared policy under the mandate in a manner making it unmistakable that Palestine can become only a Palestinian state, the road would be clear for an understanding between the Arabs and the Jews.

4. The Arab demand for the suspension of Jewish immigration into Palestine is an issue of life and death to the persecuted Jews in central and eastern Europe. It also goes to

the root of the mandate, for the stoppage of Jewish immigration would reduce the terms of the mandate to an absurdity. Only the economic incapacity of Palestine to absorb such immigration could serve as a cogent reason for its suspension.

The inquiry by the Senatorial Commission has demonstrated that there is no economic reason for suspending or curtailing Jewish immigration now.

Palestine has no unemployment problem.

The large stream of Jewish immigrants and Jewish capital has not only raised perceptibly the standard of living of the entire population. It has increased the capacity of the country to absorb more immigrants.

As for the Arab fear of an eventual Jewish majority, numbers of population need not determine control. Control can be maintained through implements of government regardless of numbers. Fear of subjection of Arabs to Jews and vice versa should be terminated by the establishment of a legislative council in which Jews and Arabs would have parity of elected representation.

5. The Arab demand for the prohibition of the sale of land to Jews, like that for the suspension of immigration, is political in nature.

The findings of the Senatorial Commission have clearly shown that there is no just economic ground for the stoppage of Jewish land purchases. No Arab landowner is obligated to sell his property to Jews. Moreover, the government requires that Arab squatters must be provided with other grants before a deal for any tract of land is closed.

The Jews now own no more than 5 percent of the land of Palestine, although they form 30 percent of the population.

The members of the Commission were profoundly impressed by what the Jewish pioneers, hailing from the ghettos, have done with the barren and rocky and sandy soil of the Holy Land. They have elevated agriculture to the position of the leading industry of Palestine and raised the level of the Arab peasantry.

There is still enough cultivable land in the country to take care of several hundred thousand additional agriculturists.

6. The practical question, however, of finding an immediate refuge for the several million Jews who are forced to flee or to emigrate from their native lands can be solved, in the opinion of Senator Hastings, if Trans-Jordan were to be opened to Jewish immigration.

Trans-Jordan was originally comprehended in the area of Palestine covered by the Balfour Declaration, but was severed from present-day Palestine in 1922 and set up as a separate Arab kingdom under the supervision of the British High Commissioner for Palestine.

The Arab ruler of Trans-Jordan is understood to be eager for Jewish enterprise and settlement. His country is backward and sparsely populated, but potentially it offers opportunities for development just as great as Palestine on this side of the Jordan.

All friends of humanity will concur with the senatorial commission that it would be an act of great wisdom on the part of Great Britain to bring about a friendly arrangement between the Jews and the Arabs of Trans-Jordan.

The opening of the latter territory to Jewish immigration would relieve the tension in present-day Palestine.

It would be an act of justice in the face of the flight of millions of homeless Jews, which would gain for Great Britain the approbation of American public opinion and of the great civilized nations of the world.

At the same time, it would assure for her the additional prize of a greater and more prosperous Palestine, which would serve as a bulwark for peace and progress at the vital junction of the British Empire.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I had intended to speak at great length on the concurrent resolution which is now before the Senate, but with permission to have printed in the RECORD at a later date my remarks, I shall merely invite the attention of the Senate to what I believe is its obligation at this particular time.

Any student of this question who will review its history must come to the conclusion that as a result of the enthusiastic embrace of the subject matter contained in the Balfour declaration, Britain was given the mandate over Palestine by the League of Nations, and that the mandate was confirmed later by a special convention which was acted upon by the Senate of the United States. The very terms of the mandate were made part and parcel of that convention. As a result of the convention, and by reason of our action in that connection, Britain was to make no change whatever without first consulting with us and securing our consent.

Mr. President, a review of the history concerning this subject will reveal the fact that Britain made many changes. It is my judgment that the whole matter is a sorry and sad story of diplomatic relations between the two countries, which a review of the subject will reveal.

One change which was made by the white paper was very objectionable, and it was made without our consent. As a result, Mr. President, the mandate is no longer a mandate to facilitate Jewish immigration to Palestine. That is what it was intended for, but it is no longer that.

One of the subsequent changes put immigration on a restrictive quota basis. But the worst changes of all took place recently when that so-called homeland, as named in the Balfour declaration—one which we all hoped would be permanently created—was made the one place where Jewish immigration is not only to be restricted, but absolutely prevented and barred.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that we agreed in a solemn convention with Great Britain that no changes would be made without our consent, and in view of the fact that changes have been made, and made without our consent, I believe that we are wholly within our duty, in fact, it is my judgment that it is our obligation, to call this matter to the attention of Great Britain and register our protest.

Mr. President, I compliment my able colleague and other Senators who joined with him in bringing this concurrent resolution to the attention of the Senate. I hope that it will be agreed to by unanimous vote. At a later date I shall make further mention of my sentiments in connection with this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the extensive and able debate on the pending concurrent resolution, and having previously spoken on the subject, I shall merely ask, on behalf of myself and my colleague

the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], that a telegram, which contains resolutions adopted by some of our constituents in Massachusetts, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., December 17, 1945.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution has been unanimously adopted at the fifth annual meeting of the Associated Synagogues of Greater Boston, held at the Temple Mishkan Tefila schoolhouse, Roxbury, Mass., on December 16, 1945, composed of 10,000 families.

"Whereas the Jewish people, which has lost 6,000,000 of its number under Nazi tyranny, and has endured untold suffering for the past 2,000 years since it has been exiled from its national homeland; and

"Whereas the Jewish people, whose historic connection with and moral right to the land of Palestine has been recognized by the Balfour declaration issued by Great Britain and adopted by 52 nations of the world, including the United States; and

"Whereas this declaration has repeatedly received the approval of vast millions of the American people, the Congress of the United States in 1922, and every President of the United States from Woodrow Wilson up to Harry S. Truman: Be it therefore

"Resolved, that in keeping with the dictates of justice as set forth in holy writ, the Associated Synagogues of Greater Boston record themselves as being in favor of the immediate opening of the gates of Palestine to the Jews of Europe who are in desperate need of a home and have indicated their strong desire to emigrate to Palestine as testified by Dr. Earl G. Harrison, the president's personal envoy and Mr. Harvey Gibson of the American Red Cross. We believe that the establishment of an independent democratic Jewish commonwealth in Palestine will give an opportunity to the unhappy survivors of Nazi persecution to once again live their lives in freedom, happiness, and human dignity in the name of Almighty God. The Jewish people can be satisfied with nothing else."

We urge upon our Senators to vote for the resolution to be reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

ABRAHAM CLOSE, President.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], is absent on important public business, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by him in support of Concurrent Resolution 44.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOSEPH P. GUFFEY, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 44

Mr. President, one of the greatest tragedies of the war in Europe was the persecution of the Jews, surpassing in violence all the pogroms of recorded history. When we read the record of primitive savagery and bloodlust we can only wonder how any survived. Yet thousands, somehow, did survive. By force of arms, we have liberated them from Nazi tyranny. But liberation is not enough. They are still homeless, still seeking some refuge where they can begin again.

That refuge can be made available. It is the purpose of this resolution to make it available. In recommending that the United States use its good offices to clear the way for free entry of Jews into Palestine, the

resolution reaffirms an historic American policy. Nearly a quarter of a century ago we placed ourselves on record in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jews. Today the need for such a homeland is more urgent than ever before. President Truman has recognized that need, and has taken steps toward its fulfillment. We can do no less.

We are committed to a policy of international cooperation for maintenance of the peace. Many problems arise in which we, as one of the great powers, must raise our voice and exercise our influence. This is one of them. We cannot evade the responsibility. In simple justice, the least that we can do is to assure the homeless Jews of Europe, victims of the barbarity of Nazi Germany, that they will have some place in all the world where they can live in peace.

There is more involved here than the question of common humanity, although that looms large. There is the question of the rehabilitation of Hitler's victims, the restoration of an important part of Europe's people to full civic usefulness.

Much has been said on the other side of the question. But I submit, without considering or discussing these arguments in detail, that the safeguard of full religious liberty for all races and creeds, which you will agree is fully capable of enforcement, is adequate to meet those objections.

Solution of the Palestine question has been too long delayed. Because of that delay, many have suffered greatly. The suffering of those who have already lived for years under the yoke of the oppressor will be even greater if we do not move quickly to meet and dispose of the question as rapidly as circumstances will permit. This resolution is part of the effort being made in that direction. I therefore urge every member of the Senate to give it full support, so that there may be no question of where America stands. We must stand, as we have always stood before, on the side of the oppressed. They beg for an opportunity to reestablish their lives. We cannot deny them that opportunity.

Let us act quickly. While we are delaying, thousands are needlessly dying.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 44) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of a letter from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] asking permission to absent himself from the Senate for the remainder of the present session. Without objection, leave is granted, and, without objection, the letter will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
December 14, 1945.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
President pro tempore of the Senate,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is necessary for me to be absent from the Senate from Friday, December 14, to the end of the session, assuming that the Senate will recess the latter part of next week.

I will appreciate it if you will submit this request for leave of absence.

With great respect, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. GEORGE.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be excused from further service on the Special Committee of the Senate to Study and Survey the Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I may say that I do this with his full concurrence.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Jack H. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Chief of the United States Naval Mission to Peru, and until reporting for other permanent duty; and

Col. Karl S. Day of the Marine Corps Reserve to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary service from the 29th day of November 1945.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Homer Allen Higgins for appointment as State medical officer for Arkansas and State medical advisor for Oklahoma under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:  
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and, without objection, the President will be notified at once of these confirmations.

## RECESS

Mr. WAGNER. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 18, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

## UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE DATE OF OATH OF OFFICE

Joseph E. Unsworth

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Emory S. Moore, Jr., August 20, 1945.

Frederic C. Bartter, December 10, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS TO BE PHARMACISTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Raymond D. Kinsey

Thomas C. Armstrong

DENTAL SURGEON TO BE SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 15, 1945

Hubert H. Martin

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Donald L. Truscott, August 3, 1945.

Frederick S. Loe, Jr., August 2, 1945.

John C. Heckel, August 3, 1945.

Eugene H. Hess, August 3, 1945.

William B. Treutle, October 1, 1945.

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Ernest C. Anderson, December 26, 1945.

Kaarlo W. Nasi, August 21, 1945.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor O. Connell, July 1, 1945.

Ardell E. Colyar, December 1, 1945.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Gilcin F. Meadors, December 1, 1945.

Clarence K. Aldrich, November 1, 1945.

Paul C. Campbell, Jr., September 1, 1945.

Lloyd R. Hershberger, July 1, 1945.

Louis Jacobs, December 1, 1945.

Allen B. Eschenbrenner, September 1, 1945.

Robert V. Holman, January 1, 1945.

Lloyd S. Rolufs, July 1, 1945.

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY MEDICAL DIRECTORS, EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 1945

Carl E. Rice

Alfred J. Aselmeyer

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 24, 1945

William B. Treutle

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS, EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Callis H. Atkins, December 1, 1945.

Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., August 3, 1945.

SENIOR SCIENTIST TO BE TEMPORARY SCIENTIST DIRECTOR, EFFECTIVE JUNE 26, 1945

Willard H. Wright

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

## POSTMASTERS

## CALIFORNIA

Emil J. Koch, Warner Springs.

## IOWA

Ralph L. Zearley, Garber.

## NEW YORK

Marie Gardner, Fly Creek.

Leonard A. Cafferty, Harpursville.

Dorothy B. Driscoll, Kauneonga Lake.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who didst manifest Thy Son by the leading of a star, we bow before the throne of Him whose earthly mission began with peace on earth, good will to men. Blessed be the Lord God who, according to His abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope wherein we greatly rejoice. We would have our hearts attuned to the angels' song: Glory to God in the highest. O let Thy holy mantle hover above the plains of night; come anew to our land; sanctify all toil; heal grief and woe. Crown us all with the spirit of love which makes good neighbors and good citizens. O Star of the East, once again climb the midnight sky, and again bless the world with the glad news of a Saviour born.

And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 14, 1945, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On December 3, 1945:

H. R. 1978. An act for the relief of Jay H. McCleary.

On December 5, 1945:

H. R. 1192. An act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the War with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands.

On December 6, 1945:

H. R. 3660. An act to provide for financial control of Government corporations.

On December 7, 1945:

H. R. 697. An act relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4127. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved March 17, 1882, as amended.

On December 11, 1945:

H. R. 304. An act to amend the act authorizing postmasters in Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations;

H. R. 1123. An act to provide for a temporary increase in the age limit for appointees to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy; and

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas McGarroll.

On December 12, 1945:

H. R. 694. An act to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940,